

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,355, Vol. 52.

October 15, 1881.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

ARREST OF MR. PARNELL.

THE announcement made on Thursday last of the arrest of Mr. PARNELL had been long desired in the interests of law and order, but by most people was hardly expected when it came. How long the satisfaction now generally felt and expressed may continue undiminished it is impossible yet to judge. The Government must certainly be congratulated upon having at last done what they ought to have done long ago; yet the congratulations cannot but be mixed with reflections upon the dangers of tardiness. The special organ of Mr. GLADSTONE's Cabinet has indeed drawn from the fact that there is a general feeling that the arrest ought to have taken place sooner the curious and comforting conclusion that the Government has acted at the right moment. It must be admitted, however, that, when the thing was once determined upon, Mr. GLADSTONE lost no chance of making its announcement impressive. The PRIME MINISTER had previously made the outrageous assertion that the anarchy prevailing in Ireland was due to the cowardice of the landlords. The Government it was said, or implied, had done everything that could be done to preserve law and order, but was powerless in consequence of the apathy of the victims of lawless tyranny. But after this amazing utterance, and, in some respects unfortunately, also after an utterance of a different kind by Mr. PARNELL, it occurred to the Government that there was one thing which they might do, and which they certainly could hardly expect the landlords to do. That one thing was to arrest, not the subordinates, but the leader of the party of tyranny—"the man," as Mr. GLADSTONE said with an eloquence which was perhaps needless in the circumstances, "who has made himself beyond all others prominent in the attempt to destroy the authority of the law."

It is, we fear, an unfortunate accident that, while Mr. PARNELL's influence and teaching only led to the Boycotting, starving, and shooting of landlords, the carding of process-servers and of any tenants who dared to be honest, and the mutilation of horses and cattle, no special notice was taken of Mr. PARNELL, but that the necessity of arresting him became evident as soon as he put himself in a position of special antagonism to the Land Act. The coincidence has already been ungratefully made use of by Mr. DILLON, and is not likely to be lost sight of. There was a certain *naïveté* in Mr. GLADSTONE's announcing at this stage of affairs that his Government, in ordering Mr. PARNELL's arrest, "had taken the first step towards the vindication of law and order, and of the rights of property"—the existence of which Mr. GLADSTONE has thus tardily and suddenly remembered; but, the first step having been at last taken, it is to be hoped that others will follow, and that the Cabinet will do its best to atone for its previous shameful vacillation. To have arrested Mr. PARNELL is to have done so far well, if it is not quite the feat of daring that it might be thought from Mr. GLADSTONE's appeal at the Guildhall for encouragement and support. But, Mr. PARNELL arrested, there remain others who are prepared to take his place and to make capital out of his arrest. The fact is that an organized scheme for destroying law and order, which might at one time have been checked with comparative ease, has been allowed to flourish and grow into alarming proportions. The beginning of its end has now been made, and it is to be hoped that the Government will no longer hesitate as to the course to be pursued.

MR. GLADSTONE ON IRELAND.

THE concluding sentences of Mr. GLADSTONE's speech on Ireland were not ill calculated to invite a return of the confidence which all good subjects would wish to place in the Government. It would appear that prolonged toleration of crime and of lawless tyranny was only to continue until the Government had ascertained whether tranquillity will result from the operation of the Land Act. If at last they effectually discharge the plainest, though the most painful, of duties, Mr. GLADSTONE will be justified in his appeal to all orders and degrees of men to support the Government. He "relies on his fellow-countrymen in their three nations associated together, and he has not the least doubt of the result." The three nations, consisting of England and Scotland and the helpless victims of misrule in Ireland, would willingly rely in turn on the Government which can alone dispose of the national force. The Minister who has hitherto failed to protect the peaceable community wantonly insults the victims of oppression when he taunts them with their failure to defend themselves. A Government has no right to stand by while force is repelled by force. If Mr. GLADSTONE referred only to agitation and verbal protests, he might have remembered that a public denunciation of the Land League would be instantly followed by social excommunication, if not by violence or murder. Even for the Land League Mr. GLADSTONE has a good word, because one of its branches proposed to try whether its objects could be attained by the Land Bill. According to Mr. GLADSTONE the condition or occasion of the proposed restoration of order would arise if the Land Bill were, on trial, rejected by the Land League and by the tenantry under their influence. Lord DERBY, whom Mr. GLADSTONE quotes with the praise which an eminent convert deserves, has expressed his belief that "the land question, as regards Irish opinion, is not settled, nor in the least likely to be so." He adds that, "if it were settled, its disappearance from the list of controversial topics would only bring on, in a direct instead of an indirect form, the claim which really underlies it, the demand for an Irish Parliament." Mr. GLADSTONE, concentrating as usual his attention on the object immediately before his eyes, implicitly encourages the demand for repeal or separation, while he pertinaciously insists on the immediate and grateful acceptance of the Land Bill. Lord DERBY, with cooler judgment, ridicules the expectation of gratitude. As he truly says, "fixity of tenure has been the direct result of two causes, Irish outrage and Parliamentary obstruction."

Although the Irish question was sufficiently engrossing to divert Mr. GLADSTONE's attention in the greater part of his speech from his customary attacks on his opponents, he could not refrain from expressing well-deserved disapproval of the conduct of a candidate who recently truckled to the Irish malcontents for the purpose of obtaining their support in the Darham election. The censure was just; but it was like a denunciation of turbulence by the GRACCHI. Mr. GLADSTONE for the moment forgot, not only Liverpool and Salford, but the zealous support which, at the dictation of Mr. PARNELL, was given by his followers to Mr. GLADSTONE at the general election. The Irish voters in the great towns were then, as now, hostile to the English connexion; but nevertheless their aid in the agitation against Lord BEACONSFIELD's Government was gratefully accepted. The next topic on which Mr. GLADSTONE touched was the accumulation in the Irish Savings Banks

of deposits to the amount of many millions, "representing almost only the honest earnings and savings of the Irish farmers." The depositors are the same persons of whom Mr. GLADSTONE, for his own purposes, recklessly asserted that to them an eviction was a sentence of death. No inconsiderable part of their honest earnings consists of the rents which they have fraudulently withheld from the rightful owners. It was but an idle boast that crime, other than agrarian, has largely diminished. No other kind of crime is either so ruinous to the welfare of a community or more sordid in its motives. The criminal classes in a civilized country stand apart from the rest of the community and below its level; nor is any general demoralization produced by the existence of a limited number of pick-pockets, swindlers, and thieves. The great mass of the rural Irish population are willingly or by compulsion accomplices in acts of gross cruelty habitually practised for motives of plunder. The diffused contagion is worse than a disease which is isolated among a few leprosy outcasts.

Mr. GLADSTONE's vituperation is so habitually directed against his Conservative adversaries that some relief was felt when he for once directed his indignant eloquence against a dangerous demagogue. Mr. PARNELL deserved all that the most fertile of orators could allege in his dispraise; but it was hardly necessary to point the invective by irrelevant eulogies on other promoters of sedition or enemies of the English Government and nation. In preparation for his attack on Mr. PARNELL, Mr. GLADSTONE exhausted the language of apology or of praise in honour of agitators, of Repealers, of would-be rebels, who had the solitary merit of not being associated with Mr. PARNELL in his depreciation of Mr. GLADSTONE's Land Bill. The Bishops of Ireland have, it seems, met "in solemn conclave" and advised the tenant-farmers to get as much as possible out of the lavish concessions which have been made to them by Parliament. The last time the Bishops met in solemn conclave they recommended, with an audacity worthy of the English Farmers' Alliance, that all or some of the members of the Land Court should be elected by household suffrage. The Archbishop of CASHEL is one of the most zealous supporters of the Land League, and he has taken an active part in its proceedings since the denunciation of the Land Bill by the League at the instigation of Mr. PARNELL. In his latest speech he impudently told the tenants that "whatever remained after making suitable provision for their families they might give to the landlord." A prudent statesman would not be tempted by momentary convenience to exalt the political authority of a body which may at any moment arouse hostility to England. Sir C. G. DUFFY personally deserves the courteous language in which his support of the Land Bill was recognized; but he also is a zealous and consistent advocate of the disruption of the United Kingdom. A laboured contrast of Mr. PARNELL's policy with O'CONNELL's was, if possible, more injudicious than the appeal to the Roman Catholic Bishops. It is true that O'CONNELL for the most part recommended submission to the law, while, with a humorous leer, he informed the mobs which he addressed that he could drive a coach and six through any Act of Parliament. At the end of his career he brought Ireland to the verge of rebellion; and civil war would probably have broken out if his meetings had not been prohibited, and if he had not himself been cowed by the prosecution from which he afterwards escaped in virtue of a legal quibble.

Still more inexcusably extravagant was Mr. GLADSTONE's elaborate eulogy on Mr. DILLON. Next to DAVITT, no other Irish agitator has been more violent, nor, indeed, has he at any time cared to disguise his animosity to England. He shocked some even of his own faction when he apologized for the mutilation of cattle on the pretence that it was less criminal to torture dumb animals than to evict human tenants. Mr. DILLON now declines to stand in the way of any benefit which the Irish tenantry may derive from an Act passed exclusively for the promotion of their interests. He still retains the purpose of fostering the agitation which is now openly announced as the ulterior object of the Land League. It is easy to understand the temporary divergence of the courses respectively pursued by the leaders of the anti-English movement. Mr. DILLON thinks that it may be prudent to accept all that the law can give, in preparation for a further struggle. Mr. PARNELL probably fears that the

Land League may be to some extent disorganized by an intermission of its subversive operations. Mr. GLADSTONE can not only forgive, but respect and admire, the mere enemy of his country. The adversary who seeks to make his own favourite measure abortive is not entitled to similar indulgence. Mr. PARNELL was not slow to take advantage of Mr. GLADSTONE's reckless rhetoric. He asked his audience at Wexford to wait for a speech which Mr. DILLON was about to deliver before they judged whether he deserved Mr. GLADSTONE's praises; and Mr. GLADSTONE has not had long to wait for the natural result of his rash tribute to the merits of an implacable adversary. Mr. DILLON, to whose patriotism and prudence he has borne gratuitous testimony, now proclaims himself a steady follower of Mr. PARNELL, and expresses his entire concurrence in the policy which Mr. GLADSTONE denounced. The rebuff is well deserved; but a Prime Minister has no right to rest the national cause on arguments which admit of immediate and certain confutation. Nevertheless, caprice and inconsistency will be readily condoned, if it is confined to fallacious rhetorical contrasts. The Government will be forgiven its past derelictions of duty if at last it enforces respect for liberty, property, and law.

MR. GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES.

OF Mr. GLADSTONE's speeches at Leeds the most faultless and the most conclusive was that which he addressed to the Chamber of Commerce. The most brilliant speaker of the present day is also the greatest master of finance and of applied political economy. The feeble and fragmentary revival of Protectionist doctrines under a new nickname furnished him with a legitimate excuse, if not with an adequate occasion, for expounding in copious detail the enormous benefits which have been derived from the maintenance during the lifetime of a generation of the system of Free-trade. His demonstration of the advantages of buying in the cheapest market was so conclusive as to justify a reasonable doubt lately expressed by Mr. BAXTER, whether the adoption of Free-trade by France, Germany, and America might not tend to the disadvantage of the country which now enjoys a monopoly of the benefits of having renounced monopoly. In referring to his former prophecy that America would deprive England of commercial supremacy, Mr. GLADSTONE forgot that he had unnecessarily declared that he should not regret the change. Mr. GLADSTONE might well have omitted his reference to the casual influence of the Fair-trade cry on a few elections. Nothing would so effectually tend to consolidate the supremacy of the Liberal party as the perversion of any considerable section of the Opposition to the fallacies of Protection. In another speech Mr. GLADSTONE unjustly twitted Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE with the heterodox opinions of a member of his party who holds the rank of Privy Councillor. Mr. LOWTHER is too manly to disguise his convictions under a quibble about freedom and fairness of trade. At a late meeting he openly avowed himself a Protectionist, and advocated a five-shilling duty on imported wheat. The leader of his party is incapable of imitating Mr. LOWTHER's blunder, and he probably regrets the introduction of an element of disunion into the Conservative ranks. The groans for Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE which Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE succeeded in eliciting from the large final meeting at Leeds may have been borne with more equanimity.

In the short speech in which he acknowledged his welcome to Leeds Mr. GLADSTONE professed satisfaction that even in that town there were some persons who were not of Liberal opinions. The division of political opinion is, as he added, one of the unvarying characteristics of a free country, "taken in common with the necessary condition of our imperfect faculties." The Opposition probably exists only because human faculties are not perfect. Mr. GLADSTONE, therefore, does not desire the extinction of the adverse party; and with this concession he exhausts his capacity of toleration. It is true that he confessed his own early connexion with the party, which was, as he explains, then led by Sir ROBERT PEEL and the Duke of WELLINGTON. He might have added that the DUKE was a Tory of a type which is now obsolete, and that Sir ROBERT PEEL would have been startled by the doctrines now held by many of Mr. GLADSTONE's allies, and perhaps by himself. By an error of memory, Mr. GLADSTONE described himself as having belonged to the Liberal party for thirty-

five years, or since 1846. He forgot that in 1858 he canvassed the county of Flint for Sir STEPHEN GLYNNE as a supporter of the Conservative Government, and that in the following year he voted for the maintenance of Lord DERBY'S Administration. The inaccuracy has no practical importance; but, after an association of a quarter of a century with a political party, the language with which he almost always mentions it seems harsh and unbecoming. Because the Conservatives call themselves by that name, Mr. GLADSTONE always designates them as Tories, except when, in dealing with foreign policy, his animosity finds expression in the more offensive term of Jingoos. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Sir R. CROSS, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. STANHOPE might perhaps expect a share of the indulgence which is accorded to Mr. DILLON, to Archbishop CROKE, and retrospectively to O'CONNELL; but the enemies of England and the opponents of the present Government seem not to be equally entitled to the exercise of political tolerance or generosity.

If the Liberals of Leeds were principally interested in the eloquence of their eminent guest, the country in general was more anxious to learn his intended policy than to criticize the language of any revelations which might be made. His declarations with respect to Ireland will be interpreted by his future action. It is at first sight not unsatisfactory to receive the assurance that he will not propose an Irish Land Bill for England or Scotland; but unfortunately the pledge would, if it became necessary, be explained away. The Farmers' Alliance Bill is at least as revolutionary as the Irish Land Bill, without any excuse for the scheme of spoliation which it contains. If it suited Mr. GLADSTONE'S purpose to promote the transfer of property from the present owners to claimants who might command more votes, he could prepare in ten minutes a speech of two hours in which he would prove that the application to Great Britain of the three F's was not made in conformity with the Irish precedent. His own prejudice against a class which includes extremely few of his supporters was strongly exhibited in his discussion of the question of local rating. As he truly said, a reduction of the rates, while it would afford immediate relief to the occupier, would confer a permanent benefit on the landlord. Consequently a demand for a readjustment of taxation "is a demand that the landlords of the country and their descendants shall to that extent be quartered on the public Exchequer." To be consistent Mr. GLADSTONE ought to refuse all concession to any part of the community which may be unjustly taxed. Any burden once imposed becomes, according to his novel doctrine, a perpetual charge on the part of the community which it affects, and if it is removed the sufferers are to that extent quartered on the public Exchequer. Twenty years ago the duty on advertisements had been recently repealed, and the gain had passed into the pockets of newspaper proprietors. Mr. GLADSTONE, instead of taunting them as incumbrancers on the Exchequer, was busily engaged in relieving them from the further burden of the paper duty. They have not since been stigmatized as public pensioners, though landlords whose rates may have been doubled within ten or five years may regard the tax as a perpetual charge on their incomes. In this, as in most other cases, Mr. GLADSTONE has two weights and measures for those whom he regards as friends or as adversaries.

In his latest speech, which was principally devoted to foreign and colonial affairs, Mr. GLADSTONE spoke with unqualified bitterness of his predecessors and their policy. He even accused the hated Tories of having wished to prevent the colonies from acquiring self-government, although successive Colonial Secretaries of either party have uniformly pursued the same policy. The only question relating to the colonies in which the country is at present interested is that raised by the failure of the Transvaal Boers to perform their engagements. There is no immediate disposition to criticize the conduct of the Government in commencing the negotiations. Mr. GLADSTONE, perhaps, could not be expected to satisfy public curiosity more fully than by the declaration that no further substantial concessions will be made—a declaration repeated with additional emphasis in his speech at Guildhall on Thursday. It was both unnecessary and unjust to censure the annexation of the Transvaal, as Mr. GLADSTONE'S colleagues formally approved the transaction, while the leader himself was silent. Mr. GLADSTONE'S reticence on the subject of the Egyptian complications was probably discreet. Diplo-

macy, if it is to be successful, must be secret; and it is impossible to know whether the reserve of the Government indicates a prudent resolve, or the absence of a definite policy. It was necessary that Mr. GLADSTONE should mention Egypt and the Transvaal; and, having transacted unavoidable business, he proceeded to gratify his own political antipathies by a wholly gratuitous disquisition on the Eastern question and on the Afghan war. Even at Leeds there were probably many Liberals who at the time concurred with an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons in preferring Lord BEACONSFIELD'S policy to Mr. GLADSTONE'S. His one-sided narrative of a series of complicated transactions can scarcely have convinced any but the most willing converts. His compassion for SHERE ALI was not qualified by any mention of the Russian Embassy to Cabul; nor was the deliberate preparation by Russia of war with Turkey either blamed or noticed. There may perhaps be a few others who share Mr. GLADSTONE'S enthusiasm for "the heroic population of Montenegro." The increase of territory which those interesting highlanders have acquired was provided by the Congress of Berlin. It is impossible to reopen with profit European and Indian controversies which, as it was thought, had at last been concluded; but a thoroughly earnest statesman never forgives his adversaries, nor does he allow them the benefit of prescription. It may be hoped that they will not in excusable retaliation accept the obsolete issues which have been tendered by their implacable opponent.

ENGLISH POLICY IN EGYPT.

THE affairs of Egypt have naturally formed part of the subjects discussed by Mr. GLADSTONE, Lord SALISBURY, and Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, and they furnished the only ground on which the rival speakers agreed. For once Mr. GLADSTONE found that Lord BEACONSFIELD had adopted a policy of which he thoroughly approved, and he announced that he and his Government would move strictly on the lines laid down for them by their predecessors. There were portions of Lord BEACONSFIELD'S Egyptian policy on which Mr. GLADSTONE would probably have passed an adverse criticism had he thought it necessary to notice them. But he confined his attention to the main result of this policy, and of this policy he generally approved. As this policy is henceforward to be the common policy of both parties, and may, therefore, be described as the policy, not of a Cabinet, but of England, it is well to have as clear a notion as possible of what this policy was. It was the policy of taking certain precautions under certain conditions for guarding the Suez Canal. The precautions taken were three, and were the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, the acquisition of Cyprus, and the intervention of England in the financial affairs of Egypt. The conditions accepted were that, through the International Tribunals, all Europe should have some kind of hold on Egypt, and exercise some sort of supervision over it; that France should share, on terms of equality, the intervention in the internal government of the country; that France should be allowed, so far as England went, free play in Tunis; and that the suzerainty of the SULTAN should not only be recognized, but should be used as a living and very effective force on appropriate occasions. On the first of the precautions taken, the purchase of the Canal shares, Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE made some just and striking remarks at Edinburgh. The purchase has turned out well in a pecuniary sense, but its utility is entirely independent of the market price of Canal shares. The real advantages which England gained by the purchase are of two kinds. In order to guard the Suez Canal we must have a canal to guard, a canal in good order, with well-managed traffic, and secured against the unfavourable influences of the elements. To keep the Canal in this state is the duty of the Company which made it, and by becoming the principal shareholder England placed itself in a position to see that this duty is properly performed. In every-day life there is an enormous difference between working from the inside and working from the outside, between guiding a Company to do what it ought to do and pressing its duties on a reluctant Company. It was to England very much what it would have been to Mr. PLIMSOLL if he could have got into the Board of Trade, when he would have been able to stop ships himself, instead of having to ring other people

up in the middle of the night to stop them. In the next place, the relations of England as the guardian of the Suez Canal towards other Powers are very much smoothed by England appearing as the chief shareholder of the Company. Otherwise England would always have been accused of bullying a poor little private Company, of talking of the Canal as if it belonged to England, and not to those who had put their money into the undertaking, and other States could have always found a pretext for interfering in defence of the interests of their subjects. France especially would have loved to patronize what was in the main a French Company. But it is by no means with France only that England would have had to deal. All Europe has been admitted to the privilege of seeing justice properly administered in Egypt, and any Power could at any time have complained of anything which it chose to consider an infraction of justice in Egypt. From these dangers, which no one with experience of Egypt would consider imaginary, England has been saved by the purchase of the shares. Not long ago Mr. GLADSTONE said that he did not see much good in the purchase of the shares, because, whether we had the shares or not, we must always trust to our navy to maintain us in our position of supreme guardian of the Canal. No doubt in extraordinary times we must trust to our navy. But we cannot be always sending ships of war and using force. It is in ordinary times—in times when we cannot use our navy, in the every-day relations of peace—that we really feel the beneficial influences of the purchase. But these beneficial influences are of a kind that may easily escape notice, because they are negative rather than positive. We escape worry, we escape awkward collisions, and our immunity from harm makes us forget that there was a harm from which we have been preserved.

While Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE dwelt principally on the first and third of the precautions to assure our guardianship taken by the late Cabinet, on the purchase of the shares, and on the good results of our financial intervention to the Government and the people of Egypt, Lord SALISBURY treated the second precaution, the acquisition of Cyprus, in a manner equally new and striking. He invited his hearers to look at the acquisition of Cyprus as a means of guarding the Suez Canal. Various objections have been made to the acquisition of Cyprus, some of which perhaps have not been satisfactorily answered; but there was one objection, that the acquisition was useless, which it will be difficult to make any more. If we look at the Canal, it is indisputable that England, with Aden at the one end and Cyprus at the other, occupies a position so commanding that no other nation has even the beginning of the means of rivalling it. These, then, were the precautions taken, and all were for their own special purpose prudent and effectual. But it must never be forgotten, that while England took precautions, she accepted conditions. As a shareholder she accepted the position of one who has a large interest, but who has to work with others who also have large interests. No practical difficulties, as Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE pointed out, have resulted from this; and the English directors have always been met with all the deference and attention they could ask. As the acquirer of Cyprus, England consented that she would put no difficulties in the way of the extension of French influence in Tunis—which merely meant that, as regards the Porte, England would not insist, in opposition to the repeated and consistent denials of France, that Tunis formed part of the Turkish Empire, and that England, as a Mediterranean Power, had no jealousy of any improvement of its position in Algeria which France might obtain by getting some kind of new hold on Tunis. Neither Lord SALISBURY nor M. WADDINGTON could have foreseen that the prize for which France was bargaining was the sad privilege of being allowed to stir up a fierce and bloody insurrection which 80,000 men have as yet been unable to subdue. As a controller of the Egyptian Government England had to admit France to an equal share in the work; she undertook to recognize the suzerainty of the Porte, and to concede to all Europe that it had a right to watch over what was being done in Egypt. That France was admitted to an equal share of the control was, as M. WADDINGTON thought, the great triumph of his Ministry. It was right to allow France to exercise this share in the control because it was unavoidable. The French were controlling Egypt, their money had made the Canal, they had been the great patrons of the KHEDIVÉ, their money

was largely sunk in Egyptian securities. There was nothing to do but to order them out of the country, under threat of war, or to work with them. When once co-operation had been agreed on, it was necessary that the co-operation should be loyal and frank. We are pledged to work with France in Egypt; and it is not for England, by petty manoeuvres, to shuffle out of any engagement she has deliberately undertaken.

We have little to do with Egypt except to keep the Canal in good order in times of peace, and to take care that nothing shall interrupt our free use of it in time of war. For these purposes we must have a good, orderly, equitable, and fairly strong Government in Egypt. Anarchy would be fatal in ordinary times to the Canal, which is very useful, but can be damaged with extraordinary ease. A bad weak Government in Egypt might offer an occasion for the intrusion of some Power which would gain a hold on the country that would be most inconvenient to us in time of war. We control the finances of Egypt not for the sake of the bondholders, but partly in order to prevent the peasantry being goaded into insurrection by oppressive taxes, and partly in order to stop the perpetual intervention through the Tribunals of the European Powers generally, to which the non-fulfilment by Egypt of its pecuniary undertakings would give an opening. We cannot allow the suzerainty of the SULTAN to be pushed to the point of military intervention, because Turkish troops in Egypt would seriously weaken our military position, and oblige us in every war to get Turkey as an ally, and because it would involve the establishment of the very worst Government that could be set up in the country. We have to work with France, and so long as France is above the suspicion of seeking secret advantages in Egypt for herself, we must work cordially and frankly with her. Recently things seem to have taken a favourable turn in Egypt, and up to this point they have been kept tolerably right by our adhering to the policy we have adopted. The Turkish Commissioners have been politely received, but they have not been allowed to assume any authority to interfere in the administration of the country, and they have shown an increasing anxiety to prove that they never meant to do any harm, and were chiefly charged with the duty of explaining to the disaffected soldiers that they had been guilty of a military crime. The despatch of an English and a French ironclad is supposed to mark that England and France are as much entitled as Turkey to interfere in Egypt. It may be a useful, but it certainly is not an important, step. The presence of ironclads belonging to other Powers will be equally a sign that England and France are not the only Powers that think themselves interested in Egypt. Much more important and decisive steps may have to be taken, but the time for taking them has not come, and there seems less immediate likelihood of their being necessary than there was some few weeks ago.

THE CONSERVATIVE LEADERS AT NEWCASTLE.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE described the contest of eloquence and invective that has been going on at Leeds and Newcastle as closely resembling a game of chess by correspondence. He himself opened the game, and made a safe, if not brilliant, move. Mr. GLADSTONE then made his attack, and managed to get forward an array of imposing pieces. For a day or two his opponents thought over their position, strove to detect all available points of attack, and made their great countermove at Newcastle. Every one, of whatever party, must own that they made it in an effective and even brilliant style. Lord SALISBURY said as many disagreeable things of the Government as could have been said in the time which he took to speak; employed language singularly clear, pointed, and polished; and never touched a subject without leaving his own special mark on it. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, though not attempting to rival Lord SALISBURY, felt the stimulus of having something to say which Mr. GLADSTONE's speeches afforded him, gained confidence from his inspiring reception, and was much more cheery and communicative than usual. It is impossible that Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE should ever eradicate from his mind that love of fairness which was born in him, and which prevents him from occupying the position, so advantageous to a denunciator, of seeing nothing but evil in his enemies. He augmented the esteem in which he is

held by those who are not violent partisans, but he lowered the tone of his speech, as a piece of party invective, when he paused to say, in words which seemed borne in upon him by a new tide of feeling, that he knew the Ministry had great difficulties to contend with, and that he was not disposed to judge harshly men striving to do their best in the hour of trial. In the main, the game was carried on according to the strictest rules of the art. The great secret is to leave out the strong part in the case of an opponent, and to bring out an opposite view as if it was the only one that a reasonable being could hold. Mr. GLADSTONE, as Lord SALISBURY observed, habitually regards persons who differ from him, not as erring human beings, but as positive lunatics. It is one advantage of these great tournaments of party orators in the provinces that the only effective answer to this method of annihilation by contempt is given in a way about which there can be no mistake. It may be added that these tournaments keep up political life in a way that in the present time is of great and increasing value. There is much more political activity in the large towns of the North than in London. Men there think and talk of political affairs with a much more lively and permanent interest than is found in the huge aggregation of the Metropolis. It is of great national importance that not only should the political activity of the provincial centres be well directed, but that its tone should be raised and its ambition quickened by the exhibition of what politics can be in the hands of those who master them. Mr. GLADSTONE and Lord SALISBURY sum up what their adherents would like to say, but cannot say. Their merits in their own line are of course different. Lord SALISBURY has not that marvellous power of arranging facts and awakening sympathy which gives Mr. GLADSTONE an unrivalled command over every audience he addresses. But, on the other hand, now that Lord BEACONSFIELD is gone, Lord SALISBURY is the only public speaker who can say things that stamp themselves on the memory of an audience and of the general public, whether those who cannot forget them agree with what is said or not. Mr. GLADSTONE has encouraged the Liberals at Leeds, and Lord SALISBURY has encouraged the Conservatives at Newcastle; but both have encouraged those who are anxious to see no decay in the scope and force of English political speaking.

It is the general result and not the various stages of political contests of this sort that it is profitable to notice. The combatants unavoidably lay themselves open to criticism. They omit, they misjudge, they exaggerate. Lord SALISBURY justly pointed out that Mr. GLADSTONE spoke of Afghanistan as if no such power as Russia existed. He himself affected to believe that Mr. GLADSTONE's announcement of more vigorous action in Ireland was mere sermonizing, and would not wait two days to see whether the estimate was wrong. He dwelt with force and earnestness on the paramount duty of England to protect the natives in the Transvaal settlement; but he did not think it necessary to add that Mr. GLADSTONE had positively announced the intention of the Ministry to fulfil a duty which it heartily recognized. He was eloquent on the subserviency of Lord RAMSAY to the Irish voters of Liverpool, but was discreetly silent as to the subserviency of Sir GEORGE ELLIOTT to the Irish voters of Durham. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE was strong on the evils of altering the rules of the House of Commons, on the pretext of obstruction, so as to make a Prime Minister despot; but he did not allow his hearers to guess that it is not obstruction, but the cumbrous machinery of the House of Commons, which chiefly engages the attention of those who think, rightly or wrongly, that its machinery must be improved. He was loud in his gratitude to the Conservative members who on every occasion had uniformly supported Lord BEACONSFIELD; but he was filled with horror at the sad spectacle of the implicit obedience which Mr. GLADSTONE now commands. Nothing could have been more exposed to obvious and triumphant criticism than Mr. GLADSTONE's unfortunate statement that to lessen the burdens on land would be to quarter the landlords on the Exchequer. The only difficulty was to select the retort, and to give point by an effective instance to the general remark that other classes who are allowed to pay less in the way of taxation are never said to be receiving public bounty. But neither Lord SALISBURY nor Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE noticed the powerful remarks of Mr. GLADSTONE on the extravagance and recklessness which seem to follow with

unpleasant regularity on the grant of money by the State in aid of local expenditure.

The general result of the contest may, however, be separated from the contemplation of details, and the general result is of great value. It is, if simply put, that the Liberals have a case, and the Conservatives have a case, and the nation has to consider both these cases. It cannot be too often dinned into the national mind that when we speak of India we must not forget Russia; that landlords are as much entitled to consideration and justice as their neighbours; that the people will lose confidence in the House of Commons if, in its endeavour to reform itself, it abandons its power of checking the Government; that Protection is dead and buried. All these things are very familiar, and it was not possible that the speakers at Leeds or Newcastle should say much that was new about them. Perhaps it was with regard to Protection that the general public waited with most interest to see if the Conservative leaders had anything new to say. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE had nothing new to say, except that he was altogether against a duty on corn; but he regarded it as a pious opinion, and not as an article of Conservative faith, that corn ought to be protected. This notion of pious opinions is no doubt convenient to a party leader, but it does not help us much in the controversy, if it can be called a controversy, as to Fair-trade. Lord SALISBURY was more definite and instructive. He had no shade of reticence in expressing his thoughts. To him the food of the people and the raw materials of the industry of the people were sacred. The pious opinion of Mr. LOWTHER that there ought to be a protective duty on corn was to Lord SALISBURY an opinion, very far from pious, that something he held sacred ought to be attacked. The only question that he could consider was the taxation that ought to be levied on luxuries. There is only one country from which we import luxuries, and that is France. Our imports from the United States and Russia are exclusively, or almost exclusively, of food or raw materials. From France we import luxuries, and especially silk and wine. Of silk as a protected article it is not necessary to speak, for what Lord SALISBURY urges is that it is quite permissible to tax French luxuries in order to get a reduction in the French protectionist tariff; and if the object were effected, any encouragement that was given to the English silk trade would disappear. The question of Protection does not, therefore, enter into the argument. Have we a right to increase the duty on French wine in order to force France to make a treaty of commerce? It is difficult to understand how any one can think we have not the right. Lord SALISBURY justly observed that this right is the very basis of a treaty of commerce. The essence of the bargain is that we give up taxes which it would otherwise suit us to impose in order to get the French to give up taxes which they say it would otherwise suit them to impose. If they will not make the bargain, we are where we were. We could with perfect propriety put any tax on French wine we pleased. Whether it would be wise to put on a higher duty than for our purposes we require is entirely a question of expediency, not of principle. We might put on this higher duty, irritate France, and not get a treaty with France after all. We might, without much friction, induce France to come to terms. The only use of a treaty of commerce under present circumstances is to get to the point at which Lord SALISBURY wishes to arrive without having to put on the screw, which, under other circumstances, he would like to see used.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE *Times* has taken a very peculiar view of the Newcastle Church Congress. According to our Mentor, that meeting "has dispersed after talking of many subjects" and thinking mainly of one. Mr. GREEN in Lancaster "Castle has been the central figure round which its 'meditations have revolved.'" Other observers have, on the contrary, been struck with the small place which the individual Vicar of Miles Platting has filled in the official sessions. Ever and anon a speaker would win his coveted cheer by a passing reference to imprisoned priests; but the debate, whatever it was, would recover itself and move on in its accustomed course. That which will make the Newcastle Congress conspicuous above all its predecessors

is the courage with which its managers selected for its bill of fare risky and burning questions—burning before the name of Mr. GREEN had passed his own narrow parish boundary—and appointed the most uncompromising men to discuss them. The result has been a Congress so harmonious and good-tempered amid strongly accentuated differences of opinion that the House of Commons might profitably take a lesson from this fortuitous gathering in the far North. A few years ago the successive discussion of Secularism and Spiritualism, of Ritualism, of the good and bad of Establishment, of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and of the principles of the Reformation would have been the lunatic programme of a clerical Donnybrook Fair. Now it has sent away the large assembly knowing more and thinking more kindly of each other than when they mustered on the banks of the Tyne. Several explanations might be offered for this result. The most obvious is that a Church Congress is after all a big school, where the boys behave the best when trusted and put on their honour. But this would be an inadequate interpretation of such a phenomenon. No amount of trusting could have ensured peace a few years ago over such subjects. The truth is that the idea of the Church as a corporate and historical body, in a sense unintelligible to Puritan particularism, has gradually taken possession of the English mind, and is now healthily affecting the discussion of ecclesiastical questions by men who have learned that reading and thinking are more excellent even than shouting. High Churchmen are, of course, most ready to apprehend the scientific and traditional definition of the Church. But the more intelligent representatives of the Broad and the Low parties have also grasped the fact to an extent of which they are themselves probably little aware. It is the law of all new tendencies to work underground till some sudden concurrence of circumstances causes them to break out into daylight. Such a concurrence was found in a Church Congress at last, and for the first time, held in the diocese of Durham. That important district of England had long been oppressed by the iron rule of a very earnest, but equally narrow and intolerant, bishop of the true Puritan stamp. Under Bishop BARING activity of thought and progress, except in the prelate's own direction, were inexorably banned. With the accession of Bishop LIGHTFOOT the pent-up waters found their vent, and the direction which they have been taking proves how futile for his own ends was the tyrannical policy of the preceding bishop. A meeting which had thought of nothing but Mr. GREEN would not have debated our actual ecclesiastical judicature in contrast with what it should be, in the spirit which marked the Newcastle debate.

Even the speakers who were set up to bless the present confusion had to fence their benedictions with admissions of desirable revision and probable amendments which notably diminished the value of their unskilful advocacy. We shall probably hear more of the rollicking denunciation of bishops and clerics in general as men devoid of the judicial mind, in which the Bishop of LIVERPOOL indulged, and which the *Spectator*—innocently accepting a misprint of the *Times*—attributed with much commendation to the peculiarly staid and cautious Bishop of LONDON. The debate on Ritual began well, and the home thrust so dexterously planted by the Dean of DURHAM when he argued that the copes which even the Judicial Committee has imposed upon bishops and Cathedral dignitaries let in the whole principle of a eucharistic dress, attached as they thereby are to the model and representative clergy of the model churches, must, at no distant period, make itself visibly felt. Illogical as the typical Englishman may be, the commonest instinct of justice between man and man is revolted at the sight of the bishop who does not wear the vesture which he is commanded to put on helping to send the parson to prison for putting on the vesture which that bishop believes that he is commanded not to wear. It is indeed remarkable that the prelates should be so slow to appreciate the moral advantage they would gain for the policy which they uphold by showing in their own persons a conformity to that which they proclaim to be the law. They may not like the cope as a dress, but it is surely as tolerable as pudding sleeves.

The weakness of the contest maintained by the advocates of disestablishment in a discussion where they had not merely fair play but full swing, was very remarkable. One clergyman of pronounced democratic politics, who was their leader, could find no more forcible arguments than

to string together instances of oppression on the part of Churchmen in times when oppression was the law of existence for all bodies of Christians alike, and when all of them availed themselves of it without scruple whenever they found the opportunity of, as they believed, doing God service by crushing their opponents. Another clergyman, of considerable reputation as a sensational preacher, had the courtesy, on hearing some words of dissent, to tell the meeting that he was unable to frame to his own mind the intellectual condition of the poor creatures who would be content to leave the choice of bishops in the hands of a Prime Minister.

A practical turn was given to the goodwill of the Congress by an appeal to the company to make up the small sum still needful for the endowment of the see of Newcastle. It is certain that, in spite of the heart which Bishop LIGHTFOOT has put into the work, a cause which was before his episcopate rather powerful in inducing the men of Northumberland to look with complacency on a separation from their old alliance with Durham, has now disappeared. Still the practical necessity for the new see becomes every day more apparent with the increase of population; so we are glad to learn that it is within, not only a measurable, but apparently a very near, distance. More fortunate than Liverpool, Newcastle possesses an old church which may be turned into a cathedral—small, indeed, but still a possible and workable one; while its internal configuration is such as to make it easy hereafter to atone for deficient dimensions by dignified and beautiful decoration. The unusually wide wall spaces found in St. Nicholas' Church might be made a field for a mosaic treatment which would, if handled by competent artists, recall the glories of Ravenna.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH AT DUBLIN.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S remarkable address to the Economic Section of the Social Science Congress will have disappointed some of his political allies by its scientific impartiality. There is no reason to suppose that Mr. SMITH has modified the strong democratic opinions which he has held for many years; but he is not disposed to countenance semi-socialistic attacks on one among many forms of property. Ownership of land is, as he truly says, neither more nor less sacred than any other kind of ownership. If the public good requires that it should be taken from the present holders, or that their rights should be curtailed, they are entitled to full compensation. To the pretence that appropriation of natural forces is unjustifiable, he replies that all material objects, down to a coat or a pair of boots, derive their value from natural forces. His respect for Mr. MILL has not blinded him to the absurd injustice of confiscating the "unearned increment" which arises from the operation of causes external to the land and to the owner's improvements. The chances of increase or decrease of value formed part of the consideration for the original purchase-money; and, as Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH said, no one proposes to compensate the owner for an unearned decrement. Almost all titles to English land are older than the unearned decrement which has arisen from the recent importations of American corn and cattle. Of the present distribution of land in England Mr. SMITH probably disapproves; but uncompensated expropriation is, as he contends, a violation not only of property in land, but of property in general. The question was but incidentally connected with the main subject of the address. Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH undertook to explain the working of economic laws, not in the world at large, but in Canada and the United States. In those countries rent for land is seldom paid, as few estates are too large to be cultivated by the occupier. No controversy arises as to the right of owning land where no man has reason to envy the condition of a freeholder, because it can be acquired at a trifling cost.

Socialism on the American Continent is, according to Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH, of foreign origin. Mr. HEPPORTH DIXON's communities are utterly obscure and insignificant, and their success and failure depend, not on their own particular theories, but on the simplest economic laws. Where celibacy is practised they thrive, sometimes resolving themselves into a kind of tontine, where the longest liver takes all the property. Those communities which become rich discourage the accession of new members, and the rest disappear like other insolvent associations. The more

serious socialism which is sometimes introduced by German immigrants takes no lasting hold on the country. Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH mentions the defeat of DENNIS KEARNEY's partially socialistic Constitution in California; and perhaps he scarcely attaches sufficient importance to the fact that such innovations could be even temporarily adopted in a flourishing and populous State. He is fully aware of the dangerous tendency of universal suffrage, if it were combined with any large amount of destitution. The most unsatisfactory element in the social condition of Canada and the United States appears to be the growth of pauperism. It may be hoped that American prudence and energy, disposing of vast natural resources, will be sufficient to suppress the evil. It is perfectly true that the agitation against landlords in Ireland has nothing to do with socialist heresies. The tenant, under the influence of his Land League orators, his priests and bishops, wishes to perpetuate the institution of property in his own person. As Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH humorously said, a socialist emissary who proposed to a peasant that his land should belong to the State would be met by arguments which would penetrate the thickest skull.

The portion of the address which was devoted to criticism of schemes for tampering with currency has happily little practical application in England. The crotchets of the Birmingham note-monger of the last generation were finally exploded by Sir ROBERT PEEL, and an overwhelming preponderance of authority is opposed to the more novel delusion of bimetallism. In the United States unsound doctrines have been propagated and practised, not so much as a result of sophistical arguments, as for the advantage of public and private debtors who took opportunities of defrauding their creditors. Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH denounces in strong language the Legal Tender Act of 1861, and the judgments of partisans on the bench of the Supreme Court who for political reasons affirmed the validity of an unconstitutional law. To the apologetic argument that the issue of inconvertible paper money was indispensable to the public safety in a time of imminent danger, it is a sufficient answer that the money might have been borrowed in the open market, instead of being unequally levied by a process which was equivalent to a forced loan. "In England commerce has a firm control "over currency legislation; in the communities on the "other side of the water it has not so firm a control, and "tampering with the currency is the demagogue's favourite "game." Proposals for cheating the public creditor by paying the National Debt in greenbacks seemed for some years after the war not unlikely to succeed. Mr. THADDEUS STEVENS, General BUTLER, and other popular leaders strongly advocated the fraud; and President ANDREW JOHNSON caricatured their proposals by contending that the debt should be cancelled as soon as the accumulated interest had become equal in amount to the principal. At one time the House of Representatives voted by a majority of nine to one for the payment of the debt in greenbacks. The intervention of the Senate saved the Republic from intolerable disgrace. The more recent device of bimetallism was due to the ingenuity of owners of silver mines. Both Houses of Congress passed a law for the purpose of making silver legal tender at a rate far exceeding its real value. The Executive Government has hitherto contrived to hamper or evade the operation of a discreditable law.

It would be both useless and invidious to offer a summary of an essay which is as lucid in style and arrangement as it is sound in economic theory. On some minor points just or plausible exception might be taken to Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH's propositions. He says that the land ought to be made to bring forth as much food and of as good quality as possible. The doctrine, which is often propounded by agrarian agitators, requires an important limitation. It is neither a duty nor a meritorious enterprise to exhaust the capabilities of land, unless additional produce can be obtained at a profit. In prosperous times high farming is generally profitable, though beyond a certain point an addition of artificial fertility is wasteful. Within the last few years the most elaborate cultivation has been the most disastrous to the farmer, who, if he could have foreseen the circumstances in which he would be placed, would have done better to hoard his capital than to expend it on the land. It is scarcely accurate to speak generally of Belgian peasant farmers as prosperous freeholders. A majority of their number pay rents which would be deemed extravagant in England, and their incessant labour is rewarded by scanty profits and an insuffi-

cient livelihood. Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH elsewhere adds his authority to a favourite doctrine of Mr. GLADSTONE's, that "idle wealth, whether it is possessed by a landowner or "a capitalist, is an evil to the owner and the community." In this sense all wealth, large or small, is idle, inasmuch as it is enjoyed without the condition of labour. A rich man is often industrious in politics, in philanthropy, in literature, in science, or even in the management of his estate. For his own bodily and mental health he does well not to be idle; but his energy is independent of his wealth. Several English magnates might be mentioned who work as hard in the administration of their property as if they were dependent on their industry for subsistence. As far as the rest of the community is concerned, the same duties might be as advantageously discharged by a land agent who would secure a small percentage of the ducal revenues. All property, down to accounts in savings banks, is in the same sense idle, although it furnishes the chief motive power of the industry of the world. There may perhaps be an advantage in the American social arrangements which, by interposing difficulties in the way of expenditure, incline rich men to make large donations for public objects. The necessity of guarding against the tenure of too much property in mortmain has probably not yet arisen. In England rich men are too often idle; yet many of them discharge with great advantage to the community unpaid public functions. A wholesome feeling or prejudice is opposed to the practice of living, as many French *rentiers* live, without employment, on small incomes. A young man who is content to vegetate on two hundred a year, without attempting to better his condition, commands neither respect nor influence.

ROME AND THE POPE.

THE Paris correspondence of the *Times* contained on Tuesday a remarkable description of the political situation in Italy. Even if we had not the assurance of the Correspondent who sends it that the statement comes from "an eminent Italian, who has rendered United Italy "immense service, who has made himself famous in "divers ways, and whose patriotism or authority cannot "be suspected," it would well deserve consideration. Rome, says this politician, is the most detestable capital that Italy could have chosen. She had no choice but to take it when she did, but it is now as necessary that she should leave it as it once was that she should enter it. So long as the Italian Government remains at Rome it alone of all the European Powers must have the Papacy for its foe. While PIUS IX. lived, Italy shared this distinction with Germany, with Russia, with Austria, with Turkey. Now she enjoys it alone. LEO XIII. has become, or is in a fair way of becoming, friends with every one else; it is only with Italy that he is not and cannot be reconciled. If this conflict ends in the defeat of the POPE, it is not the Italian Monarchy, but the Italian Republic, that will reap the fruits of victory. The House of Savoy is identified with a solution which aimed at making the two Italian Governments friends, and on the day when this solution is finally proclaimed to be a failure the Italian Revolution, which compasses the overthrow of both, will be master of the field. All that stands in the way of a solution which would make the House of Savoy stronger than ever, and give Italian unity under a monarchical Government a new and powerful supporter, is Rome. "When we have recovered a "more natural, a more logical, more central, more approachable, a less sombre and a less unhealthy capital, "all that now impedes and threatens us will disappear at "once. . . . Italian unity will be cemented by the tacit "and satisfied adhesion of the Papacy;" while the Papacy, "knowing that any revolution would destroy that work "of conciliation, would be the most powerful ally of the "kingdom in which she would have reconquered her "independent seat."

It is difficult to believe that in a society so permeated by revolutionary fanaticism as Europe is to-day such counsel as this can have a chance of being listened to. It is something, however, that sensible Italians should no longer conceal from themselves how impossible it is to make head against the Revolution if the greatest of conservative forces has to be fought at the same time. The Italian Conservatives are cut off from the very

elements which in almost every other country constitute their strength. The clergy are hostile, the peasantry are at best indifferent. The Conservatives dare not make the monarchy popular by enlarging the electorate, because they cannot feel sure that the first act of the newly-enfranchised voters would not be to return Clerical candidates. Consequently they are compelled to remain a minority in the Chamber of Deputies, unable to exercise any influence on the course of affairs, except when the various sections of the Radicals happen to fall out among themselves. While PIUS IX. was Pope there was no possibility of putting an end to this state of things. For PIUS IX., in his later years, was, before everything else, a Legitimist. He had convinced himself, or had been convinced by others, that the cause of the Church was bound up with the cause of deposed royalty all over the world; and, before he would have made friends with what he was pleased to call the Subalpine Government, that Government must have broken up Italian unity and replaced the dispossessed princes on their several thrones. Even if he had consented, under the inducement of an overpowering ecclesiastical advantage, to condone the secular robberies of which the Italian Government had been guilty, he would never have admitted their right to a single yard of Pontifical territory. It would have been useless to offer him an ecclesiastical capital; he would only have seen in such a proposal the first step towards a complete restitution. With a Pope whom nothing could induce to listen to reason, negotiation or compromise was out of the question. He might prove to have it in his power to give the Revolution a triumph over his adversary as well as over himself, and to involve the Italian Kingdom and the Papacy in a common disaster; but he would not forego his exercise of that power on any terms which it was possible to concede. The accession of what we may call a Whig Pope changed the whole face of affairs. LEO XIII. has made no overtures to the Italian Government, because up to this time there has been nothing to show that such overtures would receive the consideration due to any suggestion of truce made in the course of a civil war. But there can be little doubt that he would willingly, and even gladly, make such overtures if he thought that any good could come of it, and would still more gladly welcome them if they were made by the Italian Government. His relations with the French Government have shown how unwilling he is to be on bad terms with the secular authorities. He had every provocation to a quarrel given him if he had cared to take it, and in refusing to take it he ran very grave risk of offending and alienating an influential section of French Catholics. We may be sure, therefore, that LEO XIII. would not maintain his present attitude towards the Italian Government if that Government were to give him a sufficient earnest of its wish and intention to live at peace with the Papacy. The most obvious way in which such an earnest could be given would be to relegate Rome to the position which naturally belongs to it, and to make it once more the ecclesiastical capital, not of Italy only, but of the Roman Catholic world. This is the one sacrifice which would satisfy LEO XIII., but with this there is much reason to believe that he would be content. The POPE might then exercise within the precincts of the city of Rome the sovereign authority which he now exercises within the precincts of the Vatican, and yet no one be substantially the worse. Some few municipal ambitions might be blighted, but that would be all. The Romans who wished to make a career for themselves in the public service would follow the Government to the new civic capital, and would, no doubt, find there the career which they had once thought to find at Rome. The Roman tradesmen would probably welcome the change. The custom of a migratory Court must be a poor exchange for the custom of the Roman Catholic world; and the last municipal elections seemed to show that the contrast between the liberal promises given by the party in power and the actual performances of that party has not been without its influence on the practical Italian mind.

No doubt, as the writer of the statement in the *Times* observes, the cosmopolitan revolutionists would hotly oppose any such compromise; and the despotism which in Italy, as in France, leads politicians and Governments to succumb to the cosmopolitan revolutionists upon every opportunity might make their opposition formidable. Prince BISMARCK might effect such a reconciliation in

Germany, and CAVOUR, were he alive, might effect it in Italy; but the extremely feeble politicians who have at present the affairs of the country committed to them can hardly be expected to do anything of the kind. Whether the idea of leaving Rome which has of late been attributed to the POPE has really been entertained by him cannot be said with any positiveness; but it is obvious that he has in this idea a very powerful weapon as against his adversaries, however dangerous it might prove in the long run to the Papacy itself. It is impossible, however, to form even a guess of the use to which LEO XIII. may put this weapon. He may be unwilling to irritate the Italian nation by transferring the seat of the Papacy to another country; or he may think it expedient to let the Italian nation see that he is not to be trifled with beyond a certain point, and that if the conservative forces of Italy are to make common cause against a common enemy, the time has come when the secular power must make advances to the spiritual power. The Papacy, under the guidance of LEO XIII., is not likely to act rashly; but it will not be surprising if, in the end, it should act with more decision than the Italian Government seems to anticipate.

THE GREAT GO-BETWEEN.

THERE can no longer be any doubt as to who really sways the destinies of Europe. The fact was revealed to an astonished world on Wednesday. The *Times* has a Correspondent at Paris, and it is this Correspondent who moves the secret springs of peace and war throughout the civilized world and who has doubtless been the unrecognized channel of negotiation in the change of ministry just announced. Until now he has been content to hide his light, so far as this delicate and unacknowledged part of his functions is concerned; but, at the report of an impending interview between Prince BISMARCK and M. GAMBETTA, his feelings became too many for him, and he hastened to write two columns and a quarter about a conversation which he had in July 1878 with Prince BISMARCK. This was the more noble of him, inasmuch as he begins by saying that he has "on former occasions been twitted with putting so much material into a single interview; but," as he explains, "in the course of four hours a man like Prince BISMARCK, especially when in a communicative mood"—and to whom should he be communicative, if not to a personage of this importance?—"says a great deal that an attentive listener may well impress on his memory." The first thing impressed on this attentive listener's memory was that the PRINCE smoked a long pipe, and, like Mrs. WHITTERLY, talked on a variety of topics. Presently M. GAMBETTA's name was mentioned; and "GAMBETTA!" exclaimed Prince BISMARCK, "That is a man I should like to see before I die. . . . I am told he is bewitching. Yet it is said men who are bewitching are never great statesmen." Here was an opportunity for one of those graceful *mots* which, when uttered by the truly great, become historical. "M. THIERS once told me," I interposed, "that your Highness was bewitching, yet you pass for a great statesman." It is the judicious sprinkling of such pleasing conversational touches as this that lends a charm to the recital of even such grave affairs of State as the Paris Correspondent of the *Times* burdens himself with. Presently Prince BISMARCK repeated that he would like to see M. GAMBETTA before he died, and soon afterwards the Correspondent, left alone with Prince HOHENLOHE and Baron HOLSTEIN, arrived at a conclusion, which he put into words. He could not imagine that the PRINCE spoke twice by pure chance of his desire to see M. GAMBETTA. Prince BISMARCK knew that the Correspondent was acquainted with, among other distinguished people, M. GAMBETTA. "He did not tell me not to repeat what he had said; he emphasized his 'praise of M. GAMBETTA as though' (the italics are ours) 'to entrust me with a polite message.'" But a natural courtesy prompted the Correspondent to offer Prince HOHENLOHE, as a more intimate acquaintance of Prince BISMARCK, a share in the delicate negotiations thus suggested; and Prince HOHENLOHE, "as usual when struck" by a suggestion, looked down on the ground, and after a "moment's silence looked up smiling and nodded approvingly." Baron HOLSTEIN also agreed that "we ought to arrange the interview," and was about to discuss ways and means, when it suddenly struck the *Times* Correspondent that he ought not to be precipitate,

and he terminated the audience which he had given to Prince HOHENLOHE and Baron HOLSTEIN in, it must be admitted, a somewhat crude fashion. "It being now 11 o'clock, I looked at my watch as a sign that I had 'other duties'; and upon this royal intimation Prince HOHENLOHE of course made his bow and went away.

Naturally enough, the *Times*' Correspondent could not sleep that night for thinking of the burden laid upon him. The issues of peace and war between two great nations were virtually committed to his hands; but he was not above taking counsel with lesser men than himself, and twenty-four hours later he saw Baron HOLSTEIN again, knowing "that he must have reported to the CHANCELLOR 'what I had said; must have heard his views, and that 'what he would tell me would be what the CHANCELLOR 'thought.' The BARON, it seems, admitted that the Correspondent was right in his view of the situation; "but this general point settled, he entered into special 'considerations which I religiously committed to memory, 'for they evidently set forth the preliminary conditions 'of the interview.' Then follows a passage which shows what a wonderful memory the *Times*' Correspondent must have, but about which there is one unsatisfactory point. The last sentence of the religiously-committed-to-memory speech runs thus:—"But a meeting between two men 'with peaceful intentions, and imbued with the duties 'devolving on them, may bear salutary fruits, *even if* they 'renounce the personal satisfaction of triumphing over 'each other.' Now the whole story of the *Times*' Correspondent is nonsensical enough, but it will be seen that in this sentence there is a special kind of nonsense due to the italicized words, which clearly ought to read "especially if." Without conjecturally emending the passage mistranslated by the *Times*, we may suggest that the German word *eben* and the English *even* have some resemblance. It may be that there should have been a break at "salutary fruits," and that the sentence went on interjectionally—"Eben—ja! Wenn 'Sie, &c." Yet more remarkable is what we find a little further on. After having listened to and religiously committed to memory what Baron HOLSTEIN had had to say, the Correspondent set himself afresh to think over his great mission. "Without thinking of the possibility 'of a negotiation or compromise, or of any such thing, I 'remembered that the CHANCELLOR had declared to me 'that he had only yielded to imperative reasons, urged 'by Count MOLTKE, in demanding Metz and Lorraine." Here, surely, the great personage's memory has played him a little false. That Prince BISMARCK is in the habit of making a kind of confessor and ambassador rolled into one of the Paris Correspondent of the *Times* there can, of course, be no doubt; but that he spoke of demanding Metz and Lorraine—which is as if he should speak of Leeds and Yorkshire, or Brest and Brittany—can hardly be admitted. No doubt, however, the magnitude of the affair must be remembered as an excuse for any trifling slip in the detail of the recital. Prince BISMARCK, we are told, "seemed just then really animated with the best of 'feelings towards France—that is, of course, in so far as 'is possible with him." He spoke of her "with grave 'moderation," and even paid a condescending compliment to the French AMBASSADOR. The Correspondent's "mind was made up from that moment, and I 'determined to enter upon that serious and delicate 'negotiation." This was a lofty resolution, but unhappily, as we presently see, nothing came of it. Even the Paris Correspondent of the *Times* may be overcome by *force majeure*. He called upon M. GAMBETTA as soon as possible, meaning to broach the great subject. "But this was 'impossible at the first interview." The Correspondent had just returned from the Berlin Congress, and of course M. GAMBETTA was anxious to listen to his words of wisdom on that matter, and to nothing else. Having listened, he "summed up with his usual vigour the impression he 'had received." More than this, "he spontaneously 'authorized me to quote the summary on which I had 'congratulated him," and it actually appeared in the *Times* and was reprinted by M. GAMBETTA's express orders in the *République Française* without comment. "I 'quitted M. GAMBETTA without hinting what my object 'had been, but announcing a second call." At this second call he plunged boldly into "that serious and 'delicate negotiation." Meanwhile Prince HOHENLOHE had returned, and was told by the Correspondent that M. GAMBETTA seemed inclined to the scheme and

"had set me at ease as to the possibility of secrecy." The CHANCELLOR was to stay another fortnight at Kissingen, and "Prince HOHENLOHE asked me to see him two 'days later, to resume the negotiations."

Now comes the tragic part of the story. The Correspondent is, after all, we learn with grief, a creature of human weakness, though it must be remembered that it is not every man in high place who has the moral courage to make free confession of his weakness. When the secret meeting was first mooted he was, it will be remembered, carried away by enthusiasm, presently checked and tempered by that diplomatic judgment which led him to look at his watch and dismiss Prince HOHENLOHE. Then, in a calmer spirit, he entered upon his arduous task; and, as soon as he had heard Prince BISMARCK speak politely of the French AMBASSADOR, he hesitated no longer. He went straight to M. GAMBETTA, and, as soon as M. GAMBETTA would let him, revealed his great and glorious mission. On the one side, M. GAMBETTA was well disposed; from the other, Prince HOHENLOHE came to beseech his intervention, and this time no watch was significantly looked at. Everything seemed well in train for the momentous interview which the *Times*' Correspondent had undertaken to bring about. But now was exemplified that uncertainty of human affairs which poets and historians have ever been wont to celebrate. In the very hour of triumph a cold fit once again seized the Correspondent. When he felt that the negotiations might soon come to something, he also "began to feel 'uneasy. I reflected that any slip during that interview 'might have the gravest consequences." He pictured to himself Prince BISMARCK as he had seen him, and he found that the picture was not "bewitching." The Correspondent has, he tells us, and the assurance is comforting, "for years been able to treat with disdain 'all the calumnies that have been aimed at me"; but he quailed before "the responsibility which might devolve 'upon him in such an affair." He would face the raging of the seas, but not an angry Chancellor. Careless of the shafts which envy might aim at him, he executed a masterly movement in retreat. "I excused myself to 'Prince HOHENLOHE, did not return to M. GAMBETTA, and, 'the CHANCELLOR having left Kissingen, I thenceforth 'considered myself as unconcerned in the scheme." So ends this curious and instructive page of contemporary history. Its recital in the pages of the *Times* may seem for the moment purposeless, but possibly the future may throw some light upon the narrator's motives. Meanwhile it is at least a privilege to have learnt to whom to look for help and encouragement in European complications.

BRITTANY.

IT is now nearly forty years since the appearance of M. Emile Souvestre's well-known work, *Les Derniers Bretons*, and the picturesque and interesting article on it by Mr.—now Dean—Church in the *Christian Remembrancer*, afterwards republished in his volume of *Essays and Reviews*, not to be confounded with the ill-starred work which appeared some years later under the same title. In its outward features, both natural and architectural, the country remains, of course, much what it was, but this scarcely holds good of its moral peculiarities. The simple *pietas* and *prisca fides* which then looked to the traveller like a mediæval survival has lost something already from the closer contact induced by railways, newspapers, and other modern appliances with the civilization of an uncongenial present. It can no longer be affirmed with any literal exactness that "a couple of days"—we may now say twelve hours—"off from Paris or Southampton we may reach a race of men more difficult to piece on to modern society than those who live by the Nile or the Ganges, or sell one another beneath the Line." No doubt, as we stand in the *Champ des Martyrs* near Auray, or under the gloomy walls of the *Salorges* at Nantes, converted into a temporary prison, when, according to the brutal jest of the infamous Carrier, "*le décret de déportation a été exécuté verticalement*," and some 9,000 persons were destroyed in the course of three or four months, we may reflect that, in spite of treacherous massacres of royalist soldiers, and the wholesale drowning of men, women, and children in the hideous *noyades*, the Bretons still to a great extent "believe in their priests." "Pontivy" has outlived the fantastical attempt to rechristen it Napoleonville; "the cross is everywhere" still—or oftener the crucifix—at the cross road, on the moor, at the end of the village street, by the churchyard gate; the marvellous Calvary of Plougastel, though somewhat marred in its details, retains its quaint solemnity; and the beautiful church of Notre Dame de Folgoët still preserves the memory of Salaun, the canonized idiot lad, from whose neglected grave there sprouted the miraculous lily plant with his only recorded utterance, *Ave Maria*, inscribed on every leaf. Brittany was shown at the last

elements which in almost every other country constitute their strength. The clergy are hostile, the peasantry are at best indifferent. The Conservatives dare not make the monarchy popular by enlarging the electorate, because they cannot feel sure that the first act of the newly-enfranchised voters would not be to return Clerical candidates. Consequently they are compelled to remain a minority in the Chamber of Deputies, unable to exercise any influence on the course of affairs, except when the various sections of the Radicals happen to fall out among themselves. While Pius IX. was Pope there was no possibility of putting an end to this state of things. For Pius IX., in his later years, was, before everything else, a Legitimist. He had convinced himself, or had been convinced by others, that the cause of the Church was bound up with the cause of deposed royalty all over the world; and, before he would have made friends with what he was pleased to call the Subalpine Government, that Government must have broken up Italian unity and replaced the dispossessed princes on their several thrones. Even if he had consented, under the inducement of an overpowering ecclesiastical advantage, to condone the secular robberies of which the Italian Government had been guilty, he would never have admitted their right to a single yard of Pontifical territory. It would have been useless to offer him an ecclesiastical capital; he would only have seen in such a proposal the first step towards a complete restitution. With a Pope whom nothing could induce to listen to reason, negotiation or compromise was out of the question. He might prove to have it in his power to give the Revolution a triumph over his adversary as well as over himself, and to involve the Italian Kingdom and the Papacy in a common disaster; but he would not forego his exercise of that power on any terms which it was possible to concede. The accession of what we may call a Whig Pope changed the whole face of affairs. LEO XIII. has made no overtures to the Italian Government, because up to this time there has been nothing to show that such overtures would receive the consideration due to any suggestion of truce made in the course of a civil war. But there can be little doubt that he would willingly, and even gladly, make such overtures if he thought that any good could come of it, and would still more gladly welcome them if they were made by the Italian Government. His relations with the French Government have shown how unwilling he is to be on bad terms with the secular authorities. He had every provocation to a quarrel given him if he had cared to take it, and in refusing to take it he ran very grave risk of offending and alienating an influential section of French Catholics. We may be sure, therefore, that LEO XIII. would not maintain his present attitude towards the Italian Government if that Government were to give him a sufficient earnest of its wish and intention to live at peace with the Papacy. The most obvious way in which such an earnest could be given would be to relegate Rome to the position which naturally belongs to it, and to make it once more the ecclesiastical capital, not of Italy only, but of the Roman Catholic world. This is the one sacrifice which would satisfy LEO XIII., but with this there is much reason to believe that he would be content. The POPE might then exercise within the precincts of the city of Rome the sovereign authority which he now exercises within the precincts of the Vatican, and yet no one be substantially the worse. Some few municipal ambitions might be blighted, but that would be all. The Romans who wished to make a career for themselves in the public service would follow the Government to the new civic capital, and would, no doubt, find there the career which they had once thought to find at Rome. The Roman tradesmen would probably welcome the change. The custom of a migratory Court must be a poor exchange for the custom of the Roman Catholic world; and the last municipal elections seemed to show that the contrast between the liberal promises given by the party in power and the actual performances of that party has not been without its influence on the practical Italian mind.

No doubt, as the writer of the statement in the *Times* observes, the cosmopolitan revolutionists would hotly oppose any such compromise; and the despotism which in Italy, as in France, leads politicians and Governments to succumb to the cosmopolitan revolutionists upon every opportunity might make their opposition formidable. Prince BISMARCK might effect such a reconciliation in

Germany, and CAVOUR, were he alive, might effect it in Italy; but the extremely feeble politicians who have at present the affairs of the country committed to them can hardly be expected to do anything of the kind. Whether the idea of leaving Rome which has of late been attributed to the POPE has really been entertained by him cannot be said with any positiveness; but it is obvious that he has in this idea a very powerful weapon as against his adversaries, however dangerous it might prove in the long run to the Papacy itself. It is impossible, however, to form even a guess of the use to which LEO XIII. may put this weapon. He may be unwilling to irritate the Italian nation by transferring the seat of the Papacy to another country; or he may think it expedient to let the Italian nation see that he is not to be trifled with beyond a certain point, and that if the conservative forces of Italy are to make common cause against a common enemy, the time has come when the secular power must make advances to the spiritual power. The Papacy, under the guidance of LEO XIII., is not likely to act rashly; but it will not be surprising if, in the end, it should act with more decision than the Italian Government seems to anticipate.

THE GREAT GO-BETWEEN.

THERE can no longer be any doubt as to who really sways the destinies of Europe. The fact was revealed to an astonished world on Wednesday. The *Times* has a Correspondent at Paris, and it is this Correspondent who moves the secret springs of peace and war throughout the civilized world and who has doubtless been the unrecognized channel of negotiation in the change of ministry just announced. Until now he has been content to hide his light, so far as this delicate and unacknowledged part of his functions is concerned; but, at the report of an impending interview between Prince BISMARCK and M. GAMBETTA, his feelings became too many for him, and he hastened to write two columns and a quarter about a conversation which he had in July 1878 with Prince BISMARCK. This was the more noble of him, inasmuch as he begins by saying that he has "on former occasions been twitted with putting so much material into a single interview; but," as he explains, "in the course of four hours a man like Prince BISMARCK, especially "when in a communicative mood"—and to whom should he be communicative, if not to a personage of this importance?—"says a great deal that an attentive listener may well impress on his memory." The first thing impressed on this attentive listener's memory was that the PRINCE smoked a long pipe, and, like Mrs. WITTERTLY, talked on a variety of topics. Presently M. GAMBETTA's name was mentioned; and "GAMBETTA!" exclaimed Prince BISMARCK, "That is a man I should like to see before I die. . . . I am told he is bewitching. Yet it is said men who are bewitching are never great statesmen." Here was an opportunity for one of those graceful *mots* which, when uttered by the truly great, become historical. "M. THIERS once told me," I interposed, "that your Highness was bewitching, yet you pass for a great statesman." It is the judicious sprinkling of such pleasing conversational touches as this that lends a charm to the recital of even such grave affairs of State as the Paris Correspondent of the *Times* burdens himself with. Presently Prince BISMARCK repeated that he would like to see M. GAMBETTA before he died, and soon afterwards the Correspondent, left alone with Prince HOHENLOHE and Baron HOLSTEIN, arrived at a conclusion, which he put into words. He could not imagine that the PRINCE spoke twice by pure chance of his desire to see M. GAMBETTA. Prince BISMARCK knew that the Correspondent was acquainted with, among other distinguished people, M. GAMBETTA. "He did not tell me not to repeat what he had said; he emphasized his 'praise of M. GAMBETTA as though' (the italics are ours) 'to entrust me with a polite message.' But a natural courtesy prompted the Correspondent to offer Prince HOHENLOHE, as a more intimate acquaintance of Prince BISMARCK, a share in the delicate negotiations thus suggested; and Prince HOHENLOHE, 'as usual when struck' by a suggestion, looked down on the ground, and after a moment's silence looked up smiling and nodded approvingly." Baron HOLSTEIN also agreed that "we ought to arrange the interview," and was about to discuss ways and means, when it suddenly struck the *Times* Correspondent that he ought not to be precipitate,

and he terminated the audience which he had given to Prince HOHENLOHE and Baron HOLSTEIN in, it must be admitted, a somewhat crude fashion. "It being now 11 o'clock, I looked at my watch as a sign that I had 'other duties'; and upon this royal intimation Prince HOHENLOHE of course made his bow and went away.

Naturally enough, the *Times* Correspondent could not sleep that night for thinking of the burden laid upon him. The issues of peace and war between two great nations were virtually committed to his hands; but he was not above taking counsel with lesser men than himself, and twenty-four hours later he saw Baron HOLSTEIN again, knowing "that he must have reported to the CHANCELLOR what I had said; must have heard his views, and that 'what he would tell me would be what the CHANCELLOR thought.'" The BARON, it seems, admitted that the Correspondent was right in his view of the situation; "but this general point settled, he entered into special 'considerations which I religiously committed to memory, 'for they evidently set forth the preliminary conditions 'of the interview.'" Then follows a passage which shows what a wonderful memory the *Times* Correspondent must have, but about which there is one unsatisfactory point. The last sentence of the religiously-committed-to-memory speech runs thus:—"But a meeting between two men 'with peaceful intentions, and imbued with the duties 'devolving on them, may bear salutary fruits, even if they 'renounce the personal satisfaction of triumphing over 'each other.'" Now the whole story of the *Times* Correspondent is nonsensical enough, but it will be seen that in this sentence there is a special kind of nonsense due to the italicized words, which clearly ought to read "especially if." Without conjecturally emending the passage mistranslated by the *Times*, we may suggest that the German word *eben* and the English *even* have some resemblance. It may be that there should have been a break at "salutary fruits," and that the sentence went on interjectionally—"Eben—ja! Wenn 'Sie, &c.'" Yet more remarkable is what we find a little further on. After having listened to and religiously committed to memory what Baron HOLSTEIN had had to say, the Correspondent set himself afresh to think over his great mission. "Without thinking of the possibility 'of a negotiation or compromise, or of any such thing, I 'remembered that the CHANCELLOR had declared to me 'that he had only yielded to imperative reasons, urged 'by Count MOLTKE, in demanding Metz and Lorraine." Here, surely, the great personage's memory has played him a little false. That Prince BISMARCK is in the habit of making a kind of confessor and ambassador rolled into one of the Paris Correspondent of the *Times* there can, of course, be no doubt; but that he spoke of demanding Metz and Lorraine—which is as if he should speak of Leeds and Yorkshire, or Brest and Brittany—can hardly be admitted. No doubt, however, the magnitude of the affair must be remembered as an excuse for any trifling slip in the detail of the recital. Prince BISMARCK, we are told, "seemed just then really animated with the best of 'feelings towards France—that is, of course, in so far as 'is possible with him." He spoke of her "with grave 'moderation," and even paid a condescending compliment to the French AMBASSADOR. The Correspondent's "mind was made up from that moment, and I 'determined to enter upon that serious and delicate 'negotiation." This was a lofty resolution, but unhappily, as we presently see, nothing came of it. Even the Paris Correspondent of the *Times* may be overcome by *force majeure*. He called upon M. GAMBETTA as soon as possible, meaning to broach the great subject. "But this was 'impossible at the first interview." The Correspondent had just returned from the Berlin Congress, and of course M. GAMBETTA was anxious to listen to his words of wisdom on that matter, and to nothing else. Having listened, he "summed up with his usual vigour the impression he 'had received." More than this, "he spontaneously 'authorized me to quote the summary on which I had 'congratulated him," and it actually appeared in the *Times* and was reprinted by M. GAMBETTA's express orders in the *République Française* without comment. "I 'quitted M. GAMBETTA without hinting what my object 'had been, but announcing a second call." At this second call he plunged boldly into "that serious and 'delicate negotiation." Meanwhile Prince HOHENLOHE had returned, and was told by the Correspondent that M. GAMBETTA seemed inclined to the scheme and

"had set me at ease as to the possibility of secrecy." The CHANCELLOR was to stay another fortnight at Kissingen, and "Prince HOHENLOHE asked me to see him two 'days later, to resume the negotiations."

Now comes the tragic part of the story. The Correspondent is, after all, we learn with grief, a creature of human weakness, though it must be remembered that it is not every man in high place who has the moral courage to make free confession of his weakness. When the secret meeting was first mooted he was, it will be remembered, carried away by enthusiasm, presently checked and tempered by that diplomatic judgment which led him to look at his watch and dismiss Prince HOHENLOHE. Then, in a calmer spirit, he entered upon his arduous task; and, as soon as he had heard Prince BISMARCK speak politely of the French AMBASSADOR, he hesitated no longer. He went straight to M. GAMBETTA, and, as soon as M. GAMBETTA would let him, revealed his great and glorious mission. On the one side, M. GAMBETTA was well disposed; from the other, Prince HOHENLOHE came to beseech his intervention, and this time no watch was significantly looked at. Everything seemed well in train for the momentous interview which the *Times* Correspondent had undertaken to bring about. But now was exemplified that uncertainty of human affairs which poets and historians have ever been wont to celebrate. In the very hour of triumph a cold fit once again seized the Correspondent. When he felt that the negotiations might soon come to something, he also "began to feel 'uneasy. I reflected that any slip during that interview 'might have the gravest consequences." He pictured to himself Prince BISMARCK as he had seen him, and he found that the picture was not "bewitching." The Correspondent has, he tells us, and the assurance is comforting, "for years been able to treat with disdain 'all the calumnies that have been aimed at me"; but he quailed before "the responsibility which might devolve 'upon him in such an affair." He would face the raging of the seas, but not an angry Chancellor. Careless of the shafts which envy might aim at him, he executed a masterly movement in retreat. "I excused myself to 'Prince HOHENLOHE, did not return to M. GAMBETTA, and, 'the CHANCELLOR having left Kissingen, I thenceforth 'considered myself as unconcerned in the scheme." So ends this curious and instructive page of contemporary history. Its recital in the pages of the *Times* may seem for the moment purposeless, but possibly the future may throw some light upon the narrator's motives. Meanwhile it is at least a privilege to have learnt to whom to look for help and encouragement in European complications.

BRITANNY.

IT is now nearly forty years since the appearance of M. Emile Souvestre's well-known work, *Les Derniers Bretons*, and the picturesque and interesting article on it by Mr.—now Dean—Church in the *Christian Remembrancer*, afterwards republished in his volume of *Essays and Reviews*, not to be confounded with the ill-starred work which appeared some years later under the same title. In its outward features, both natural and architectural, the country remains, of course, much what it was, but this scarcely holds good of its moral peculiarities. The simple *pietas* and *prisca fides* which then looked to the traveller like a mediæval survival has lost something already from the closer contact induced by railways, newspapers, and other modern appliances with the civilization of an uncongenial present. It can no longer be affirmed with any literal exactness that "a couple of days"—we may now say twelve hours—"off from Paris or Southampton we may reach a race of men more difficult to piece on to modern society than those who live by the Nile or the Ganges, or sell one another beneath the Linc." No doubt, as we stand in the *Champ des Martyrs* near Auray, or under the gloomy walls of the *Salorges* at Nantes, converted into a temporary prison, when, according to the brutal jest of the infamous Carrier, "*le décret de déportation a été exécuté verticalement*," and some 9,000 persons were destroyed in the course of three or four months, we may reflect that, in spite of treacherous massacres of royalist soldiers, and the wholesale drowning of men, women, and children in the hideous *noyades*, the Bretons still to a great extent "believe in their priests." "Pontivy" has outlived the fantastical attempt to rechristen it Napoleonville; "the cross is everywhere" still—or oftener the crucifix—at the cross road, on the moor, at the end of the village street, by the churchyard gate; the marvellous Calvary of Plougastel, though somewhat marred in its details, retains its quaint solemnity; and the beautiful church of Notre Dame de Folgoët still preserves the memory of Salaun, the canonized idiot lad, from whose neglected grave there sprouted the miraculous lily plant with his only recorded utterance, *Ave Maria*, inscribed on every leaf. Brittany was shown at the last

elections to be the one corner of France where the monarchical sentiment retains its power; and there are still whole regions there, out of the towns, where few of the men, and none of the women, understand a word of ordinary French. But, nevertheless, there is a perceptible difference. It is e.g. a rare exception in the Tyrol to see a peasant pass the wayside cross or frescoed shrine without doffing his cap; in Brittany, where the crosses are quite as frequent, it is almost as exceptional to see any passer-by take the slightest notice of them. The churches are open all day, but during the greater part of it their silence is only broken by the almost "invariable ticking of the clock" or the clattering sabots of the two or three old women who are usually to be found there; it is fair to add, however, that there is a considerable attendance in the early mornings even of weekdays, while, on Sundays a large number of men may be seen at the low masses, though comparatively few are present at High Mass or Vespers. But it is clear from many little signs that the old devotion, or superstition, or simplicity, or whatever we please to call it, is gradually dying out. The departed spirits no longer appear on All Souls day in the Bay of Trépassée—where the vast and wicked city of Ys, "the modern Sodom," sunk under the avenging wave—and even "mysterious Carnac," as our readers may have gathered from the work of Mr. Miln reviewed the other day in our columns, is compelled to submit its mystery to the realistic handling of archaeological research. The schoolmaster is abroad even in Brittany, and the bright intelligent boy, who acts as your cicerone to the curious dolmen called the "Butte de César" at Locmariaker, is as much at home in French as in his native Breton tongue, and will tell you of brothers of his who are also adepts in English. We are by no means disposed to endorse the sweeping indictment brought by some English sojourners in Brittany, that "all the men are atheists," which at most is only true of a portion of the upper class, but there is too much reason to fear that a great many of them are at least occasional drunkards, and it is certain that the English tourist has taught them to keep a much sharper eye on their gains than formerly, though the general cost of travelling in Brittany is still decidedly below the average of the rest of France. Of the old costume, of which splendid specimens may be seen in the Museum at Quimper, little remains in ordinary use, as far as male attire is concerned, except at some out-of-the-way places like Pont l'Abbé; but the female head-dress, though not so picturesque as the high caps worn on high days and holidays in Normandy, has a stranger effect from its close similarity to conventual forms, and as female servants supply the place of the *garçon* at almost all Breton table-d'hôtes, it is difficult at first to avoid the impression that lay sisters are waiting upon you—and generally, it must be confessed, waiting very clumsily. Indeed there is a marked superiority of the man over the woman, both in appearance and intelligence, observable, as a rule, throughout the country.

But most travellers in Brittany at the present day will find their chief interest in the scenery and the architectural monuments, whether Christian or "Druidical," as they are sometimes vaguely termed, though this use of the phrase Druidical is at best but a veil to disguise our ignorance. The scenery of Brittany generally, and notably of certain districts—such as the neighbourhood of Quimperlé and Lannion, and the region lying between Huelgoet and Carhaix—differs conspicuously, and most favourably, from the dull uninteresting dead level characteristic of northern France elsewhere. Both in detail and general effect the moors and river banks and wooded slopes, with their granite rocks and rich growth of ferns of every kind, will recall to those familiar with it the lovely scenery of South Devon. The pedestrian may roam for miles and miles along the steep, rocky banks of the Isère and Elie, or track the sparkling, dashing Guier up from Lannion to the ruined castle of Tonguédec, or explore the wooded heights and moors that stretch far away from Huelgoet—where the site of a mountain chalet of Anne of Brittany, secluded from all sounds but that of the rushing waterfall, is still shown—and may well fancy himself on Dartmoor, or on the banks of the Erme or the Yealm, or—but for the absence of lakes—in parts of Westmoreland or Cumberland. And the narrow lanes, with their high banks and hedges—so utterly unlike the normal type of French roadways and the roughly constructed stone walls which often fence them in or divide field from field, with their irregular steps, in place of stiles, recall another characteristic Devonian peculiarity. We do not mean of course that the whole of Brittany is like the most picturesque parts of Devonshire. This cannot truly be said of the rather overpraised scenery of Dinan; the banks of the Rance are very pretty, and may recall the Thames at Richmond or even at Pangbourne, but they are never more than pretty. Nor can anything be drearier than the straight dusty road from Auray to the hugely popular but aesthetically most uninviting shrine of St. Anne, or the longer course from Auray to Carnac—those who are wise will take a boat to Locmariaker—or from Quimper by Pont l'Abbé to Pénmarch—a somewhat over-rated point of view, by no means to be compared with the rocky promontory of Point de Raz. But still there is a great deal of this charming scenery, with its mountain streams, and granite rocks, and moorland, throughout Western Brittany, though it will mostly be missed by those who keep to high roads and railways. The abundance of granite, to which reference has been already made, helps of course to account for the "menhirs" and "dolmens" about which so much has been written, and so little is certainly

known, but on which we need not dwell at length here, as we so lately had occasion to review a work bearing on the subject. Suffice it to say that there can no longer be any doubt, after recent exhumations, of the sepulchral nature of the dolmens, consisting of two or more upright stones with another or several others laid over them, while it is more than probable that every dolmen was originally covered by a tumulus, though in many cases the superincumbent earth has wholly or partially fallen away or been removed in the lapse of ages. The most perfect example of this kind of construction is that on the little island of Gavr' Innis, with its elaborate wall sculptures, partly in spiral lines, supposed by some—wrongly, we conceive—to denote serpent worship, while next to it comes the "Butte de César" on the mainland, of about equal dimensions but of less curious workmanship. Of the proper destination of the menhirs, whether for religious or civil or sepulchral purposes, it is less easy to speak with confidence, no bodies having been as yet discovered buried under them. But it is a mistake to suppose, as might be gathered from the ordinary guide-books, that a continuous street, so to term it, of these monumental stones stretches for miles from Kerlescant to Moenac. They are found in groups at various intervals between these extreme points, but there is nothing to show that any continuous line ever existed, and solitary menhirs, or two or three together, are frequently found elsewhere, while many more have fallen or been broken up for farm-buildings and the like. That similar monuments are occasionally to be seen in Cornwall and Wales is not wonderful—whatever explanation of their design be accepted—when we recollect, what the very names of Wales and Cornwall indicate, that the same Celtic race who peopled Brittany passed over to the western shores of this island, where they left indelible traces both on the soil and in the blood and language of the native inhabitants.

We have left ourselves little room to speak of the church architecture of Brittany, on which alone a volume might be written. It has been justly observed that the older parish churches have a peculiar character of hardness, dreariness, and almost grotesque sternness about them. This arises partly from the granite without and whitewash within, while the heavy appearance is greatly increased, both within and without, sometimes by the church ending in a cross transept at the east end without a chancel, and much oftener from the unbroken lines of the long low roof extending over the side aisles without any clerestory, which mars the grandeur even of the very striking Collegiate Church at Pont Croix, and is only partially relieved, there or elsewhere, by the tall and graceful spire of pierced granite which is so common a feature of otherwise quite insignificant village churches. Such a noble shrine as that of our Lady of Folgoet, erected in the fourteenth century—one of the finest churches in Brittany after the Cathedrals—must be considered exceptional. Its solemnity of effect as a whole is not less remarkable than the exquisite tracery of porches and windows and rood-screen; nor does the peculiar structure of the long southern transept, with its magnificent porch and the three altars against its eastern wall—looking like a subsidiary aisle, turned at right angles to the body of the church—convey any impression of ungracefulness, while the lofty spires, over 150 feet high, flanking the western porch, add much to the lightness as well as the dignity of the general appearance. If the Breton Cathedrals retain something of the stern simplicity, they have more than all the grandeur of the best specimens of parish churches. None of them can boast the wealth of ancient stained glass which is the special glory of Chartres, or the marvellous and unique grace of the eastern end of Le Mans, with its double cincture of choir aisles and cordon of side chapels beyond them, and forest-work of flying buttresses and pinnacles, as it is visible, unlike too many French cathedrals, from the broad open space around it. But Quimper, which is the finest, and St. Pol de Léon, one of the oldest, of the Cathedrals in Brittany, which bears a strong family likeness to Quimper, on a smaller scale, have also their double row of choir aisles, and Quimper is rich—though not so rich as Chartres—in old painted glass, while the lofty roof, rising to a height of 120 feet, and the two western spires of 250 feet high, add greatly to its external grandeur. The cathedral towers of Léon are somewhat dwarfed by the immediate neighbourhood of the gigantic Creisker spire, nearly 400 feet high, overshadowing a church not large or otherwise remarkable, except for the perceptible inclination of the nave—not the choir—in a southerly direction, a speciality observable in the choirs of some other Breton churches. Quimper is still an episcopal see, but Léon, like Dol, Tréguier, and some other Breton Cathedrals, each with a character and history, and a special beauty of its own, is no longer the seat of a bishop; there may be seen indeed in the north choir aisle the kneeling effigy of John Francis de la Maroshe, the last of his line, with a long Latin inscription telling how he was the administrator of the supplies granted by the English Government to the *émigré* clergy, and died in London in 1806. There is something in this constant recurrence of unmitred sees which seems to deepen the resigned, old world, melancholy air attributed by Souvestre to Breton religion, and which certainly accords at Léon with what an English writer calls "the deathlike stillness of the scarcely living city." Indeed, as we pass from town to town of Brittany, each with its crumbling castle, its quaint solemn churches, and its narrow silent streets, *Troja fuit* seems to be everywhere inscribed. We seem to be wandering amid the debris of an extinct volcano. The strength of two successive forms of social and religious life, once full of creative power—the pagan and the mediæval—is

traced in imperishable characters on the stones of Carnac and on the granite shrines of Folgoet and St. Barbe, and in those mute memorials is contained the history of Brittany. It will no doubt gradually become assimilated to the life of modern France, as the old nomenclature is already succumbing to the new departmental divisions of Finistère, or Morbihan, or Côtes du Nord; but the more completely it succeeds in identifying itself with the "ideas of '89," and wipes away the Parisian reproach of "*le pays le plus arriéré de la France*," the more entirely will it lose all identity with its own past. The "revolutionary torrent" of advancing intellect, to cite an ugly jest of Carrier's, may prove far more effective than the deadly waters of the Loire. Morbihan and Finistère may attain to the highest ideal of French civilization, as it is understood by senators and savans of the day, but "poor rough Brittany," which, as Michelet sneeringly complained, "is so Gaulish that it is scarcely French," will have ceased to exist. It is the one district of France that has dared to be more than a century old; and in modern France to break with the national history in an inexorable condition of conformity to the national life.

GHOSTS IN THE DAILY TELEGRAPH.

SOME one has said that, if you have a thoroughly dull neighbour at dinner, you can always arouse and interest her by introducing the subject of ghosts. The newspapers have been suffering lately from a terribly dull season, and are at their wits' end for subjects to discuss. The *Daily Telegraph* has had the happy thought of getting up a public discussion about bogies. Every observant person knows how these discussions are started. First you have an able leading article, expressing an intelligent scepticism. Then some one, probably "in the office," writes a long letter, complimenting the able "leader," and "proposing," as Mr. Paley makes Pindar say, "a subject for discussion." When the subject is ghosts, the public rushes eagerly in, with stories about visions beheld, and mysterious noises heard, by its sisters, and its cousins, and its aunts. The *esprit fort* of the middle classes is allowed to have his say, and demonstrates that ghosts are contrary to common sense, and to the accepted principles of the "latter end of the nineteenth century."

The *Telegraph* and its correspondents have gone regularly through this programme, without actually raising the veil which "severs ghosts from shadow-casting men," and without even adding much that is new to the common stock of ghost stories. The death of Lord Airlie furnished a leader-writer in the *Telegraph* with a peg to hang his article upon. Most people have heard of the "Airlie Drummer," who plays his mystic drum-taps when any member of the house is about to die. The drummer is as well known as the "Drummer of Tedworth" was in the seventeenth century. Old families plume themselves on these airy retainers. A Scotch house believes that it possesses a field in which there is a hidden treasure. When any one approaches for the purpose of digging up the gold, a frightful storm of thunder and lightning punishes his temerity. "And do you really believe that the whole atmospheric system of the planet is revolutionized for the sake of the Macbuddies of Talloch-buddie?" a sceptical lady asked a member of that ancient sept. But the faith of the Macbuddies is proof against such impious rationalism, and so is that of persons happy enough to possess a family banshee or ominous animal. We are acquainted with a Scotch family in which a black cat always appears "where nae cat should be," and that in the presence of three or four witnesses, before a death in the family. The last apparition "came off" about three years ago, when three ladies of the family saw the mysterious animal, which disappeared as strangely as it had come. Within a month a sister of these ladies died, and they discovered, from an entry in her diary, that she had seen the ominous cat on the same night on which it had appeared to them. Many such anecdotes will be given to the world when some imitator of Sir Bernard Burke publishes "*The History of the Scottish Middle Classes*."

But these agreeable reminiscences have led us away from the *Telegraph* and the Airlie Drummer. Philosophers can readily account for the apparition of warning creatures peculiar to certain families. This is the last service of the Totem, the protecting and friendly animal attached to savage households in America, Africa, Northern India, and Australia. It is less easy to explain the Drummer, and, indeed, the evidence about his performances is not consistent. The *Telegraph* started the subject by averring that on August 19, 1849, a young Englishman heard music like that of "a brass band" as he was making his way to a shooting lodge of Lord Airlie's. The strains of the brass band were, as usual, ominous of disaster. Indeed, even in the suburbs, brass bands are little better than nuisances. The publication of this legend "drew" Mr. N. Macleod, who wrote to the *Telegraph* laconically thus:—"The warning which is heard at Cortachy when any misfortune is about to befall the family is a single drummer, not a band of music." And this, as some one says in *Silas Marner*, "seems a deal likelier"—for brass bands are comparatively modern, and the ghost is an old ghost, not at all likely to be equal to playing the "*Wacht am Rhein*." But here again the evidence is conflicting, for another correspondent brings evidence to show that a lady "connected with one of the oldest titled families in Scotland" heard a "band of music" early in the spring of 1845, that a gentleman explained the noise to have been caused "by the

drummer-boy," and that a death did happen in the family in about three months. A correspondent of the *Birmingham Daily Post* vouches for it that a certain Miss S. heard "heavenly music" when Lord Airlie was suffering from gout. Mrs. Ann Day, who was at Cortachy Castle in the capacity of lady's-maid in 1845, heard a carriage drive up to the door, when, in point of fact, no carriage was there, and was also startled by the sound of a fife and the beating of a drum. "About this there was something indescribably disagreeable; it seemed as if the drummer were making his way through the floor." In this case, then, the music was far from "heavenly." Thus we are, it will be admitted, confronted with a certain discrepancy of evidence. The music is sometimes heavenly, sometimes disagreeable; occasionally it appears to resemble the strains of a brass band on a lonely heath, and again it impresses the listeners as if it were caused by a drummer-boy contending, not only with the difficulties of his art, but with the arduous task of working his way up through the floor. The only practical question raised is this—Would it be fair for a person who has had a "warning," whether conveyed by a black cat or a white bird, by a drummer-boy or a brass band, to go and insure his life heavily for the benefit of his family? In an agreeable but, we fear, fictitious narrative, Mr. James Payn has introduced us to an Annuity Company which keeps a second-sighted man on the premises, and regulates its dealings by his visions, which invariably prove correct. If he sees a shroud on the client's breast, most generous arrangements are instantly made. But—no shroud, no annuity.

In addition to the Airlie Drummer, the *Telegraph* was exercised by the ghost of Miss Sarah Duckett, which appeared more than once to a farmer named Roberts at Church Stretton. Church Stretton boasts an abortive mine, now filled up, and called the Copper Hole. As the ghost of Miss Duckett appeared to Farmer Roberts in the vicinity of the Copper Hole, the neighbours drew the conclusion that her bones reposed at the bottom of that gulf. They therefore cheerfully subscribed money and hired labourers to excavate the hole. Nothing was found at the bottom but one old shoe. Church Stretton, therefore, now possesses a hole which has been twice dug out to the depth of forty feet, with no other result than the discovery of an ancient piece of shoe-leather. It is doubtful whether a hole with such interesting associations could be found even in the neighbourhood of Gotham.

The philosophic correspondents of the *Telegraph* are not more full of information than the believers. Indeed, of all the letters, we prefer that of "A Sceptic," who knows of a very good sample of a haunted house situated, like most haunted houses, "in the West of England." When The Mulligan was asked for his address, he used to wave his hand so as to indicate a large arc of the horizon, and say, "I live down there." "The West of England" is almost as vague an address; too vague even for a bogie. The people who live, along with the ghosts, in the house "are completely upset and rendered miserable by apparitions and mysterious occurrences which can neither be explained, terminated, nor tolerated. The lady of the house cannot live in it," being exasperated beyond endurance by nocturnal noises, and "the shadowy form of a woman holding a child in her arms." Governesses, too, horrible to relate, have heard doors opening and shutting in the dead of night! This is an extent of ghostly experience with which we ourselves are not unfamiliar. The children (when bored with the nursery) come down stairs and say that "The lady is there again." An accomplished London detective has failed to find even a clue to the cause of the nuisance. We can only say, if the ghost is a ghost—"bolt it with a bishop." This plan, that of exorcism, had lately the most satisfactory results in a house (also in the West of England) which was haunted by the ghost of a woman in purple velvet. The sceptic who tells this story rejects the customary explanation—"rats." Indeed the most imaginative could with difficulty convert a rat into the shadowy figure of a woman with a child in her arms.

As a pendant to the ghost in the West of England, we purpose to describe one which, to our knowledge, appeared lately in a small village near Chipping Norton. This ghost has always appeared to us one of the most "creepy" and disagreeable, while wholly unaccounted for, and uncalled for, of modern apparitions. The village of which we speak consists of one long line of comfortable old houses. The Manor House is but a very short distance from the village street. The wife of the squire happened to be driving through the village, one bright August afternoon, when four children rushed, in unconcealed alarm, out of the open door of a cottage. So terrified was one of the children that she (or he) had a fit on the spot. The lady stopped her carriage and asked the children what was the matter. They explained that they had been frightened by seeing a strange woman on the stairs where they had been playing. On being asked to describe the woman, they said that she was dressed in a long strait dress of flannel, fastened at the throat, and that she had a white band fastened under her chin, and another bound round her body. In fact, they described an old-fashioned corpse as it would appear when prepared for the grave, in the days when the law enjoined that the dead should be buried in flannel. There seems something uncomfortable in the apparition of the ancient dead to the eyes of a set of village children on a sunny August afternoon. Perhaps the M.A. of the *Telegraph* who knows so much about the Hindoos will explain that this "so-called spiritual phenomenon took place in the Akash, or ether, by exercise of ascetic powers, or cultivated will," whatever that may mean. The

more uncompromising sceptic will say that the children had been expecting to see a corpse of the old school, and so were the victims of unconscious cerebration. Other incredulous persons will remember how the Ettrick Shepherd accounted for the wraith beheld by his grandmother—"aiblins my grandmither was an awfu' leear."

THE REPORT ON LEGAL PROCEDURE.

THE legal profession bids fair to be relieved from the reproach of being behindhand with respect to reform and progress. Much has been done within the last ten years towards accelerating and cheapening legal procedure; and more has been suggested and attempted, but has hitherto failed to take effect by reason of the supineness of the Legislature, as witness the Criminal Code and the multitudinous Bankruptcy Bills. The latest effort in the direction of reform is fortunately one which it is to a great extent within the power of the judges to carry out without recourse to Parliament, and we may therefore reasonably hope to reap its benefits at an early date. The report of the Committee on Legal Procedure, appointed last January by the Lord Chancellor, has now been published; and, if approved by the judges empowered to make new rules of court and embodied by them in such rules, will work a very considerable change in the legal system of this country. The great desideratum with regard to law as with regard to other commodities is that it should be good and cheap. The character and attainments of the occupants of the judicial bench afford a sufficient guarantee for its goodness, so far as the administration is concerned; but, despite many improvements in our procedure, the expense and delay involved in legal proceedings amount in many cases to a practical denial of justice. This expense and delay have long been mainly attributed to two causes, the cumbrous and dilatory nature of the proceedings, obligatory and optional, between the parties prior to the trial of the action, and the number of appeals of one kind and another open to a defeated suitor without reference to the importance of the matter at stake. This view is practically confirmed by the report of the Committee.

Their first suggestion deals with an important item of preliminary delay and expense, namely, the pleadings in a cause, not the oral pleadings, commonly so called, by counsel in court, but the written or printed statements of their case delivered by each party. These, though deprived of much of their original technicality by the Judicature Acts and rules, still occasionally attain inordinate dimensions, and serve to conceal the point at issue rather than to elucidate the point at issue or give it due prominence. Special pleading as a science is practically defunct, and the very large powers which judges possess of amending the present pleadings at any stage of the cause, up to and including the trial itself, have rendered them of secondary importance. If pleadings do not contain all that they should, the judge may, and indeed is bound to, supply the deficiency, and occasionally does so to the extent of allowing one party to set up an entirely new case. Yet the construction of even the modern modified pleadings necessitates the employment of counsel once at least by each side, and the rules of procedure allow a considerable period for their preparation and delivery, during which little or nothing else can be done. The Committee had been invited to consider the possibility of abolishing pleadings altogether in the Queen's Bench Division, substituting a somewhat fuller endorsement on the writ than that at present in use, to which the defendant should, on appearance, deliver a similarly concise answer. The Committee, however, finding, from statistics compiled by them, that 61·12 per cent. of the total actions commenced in 1879 were settled on the basis of the writ alone, consider that it would be unadvisable to increase the cost of a process which has proved so efficacious in its native simplicity. Retaining the writ, therefore, in its existing form, they suggest that the defendant shall within a specified time give notice of any special defence he proposes to set up which, without such notice, might take the other party by surprise, to which the plaintiff may in his turn give notice of any similar matter on which he intends to rely; silence all the while implying, not consent, but a general denial of the statements and rights of the other party, putting him to proof of all which it lies upon him to prove. Pleadings, without being abolished, are only to be allowed by order of a judge. The plan seems plausible and straightforward enough, and the model on which it is obviously formed—namely, the procedure in County Courts—has been found to work well. The instances adduced by the Committee of the very large class of mercantile and other cases in which the issue is from the outset perfectly plain, certainly go far to show the general inutility of pleadings, and of course no judge would refuse leave to deliver pleadings where the nature of the case made it impossible to bring the necessary allegations within the limits of an endorsement.

One point in favour of the retention of pleadings, at least in certain cases, has been overlooked or, rather, misinterpreted by the Committee. Referring to 35·10 per cent. of the actions in 1879, which they return as "unaccounted for, and therefore presumably settled or abandoned after some litigation," they thence infer that in those cases "pleadings were of little use." We cannot acquiesce in this deduction. It frequently happens that the detailed statement of the case by either side brings out with crushing clearness the unsuspected strength of an opponent's position, and so leads to

submission or compromise. It may be said that many of the statements in pleadings are purely formal, and not founded on fact; but when such statements are made, the author of them may be put on oath as to their truth, and his antagonist may take it that what he swears in answer to interrogatories he will stick to in the witness-box. Still the class of cases in which this would be likely to occur would be the class of cases in which the present pleadings would still be available. It is, perhaps, with reference to this question of pleading that one feels most the disadvantage of the Committee's having been restricted in their investigations to the procedure in the Common Law Division. The Chancery Bar is by far the greatest transgressor in prolixity, diffuseness, and irrelevancy in pleading, and it would be straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel were any rule made minimizing Common Law pleadings and letting Chancery pleadings go scathless. Indeed, the Committee go out of their way to imply as much in their Report.

The next abuse attacked by the Committee is one to which the Common Law Division is, on the other hand, perhaps more liable than the Chancery, and which certainly requires redress. The sort of skirmishing at Judges' Chambers which precedes the general action in court is one of the most fertile sources of legal expense, and the facilities for this species of warfare afforded by the existing system frequently enable one party to drive his antagonist out of the field by the brute force of a longer purse. A multitude of summonses may be taken out which, without being definitely groundless or vexatious, are practically tentative and usually futile, and which pile up costs and terrorize the opposite party. The Committee propose to substitute a sort of omnibus summons, on the hearing of which the Master may give directions as to any interlocutory proceedings to be hereafter resorted to in the suit, and also as to the mode of trial. In order to save time and secure uniformity of decision, the Committee further suggest that every case should be assigned from the beginning to some particular Master's list, thus obviating the necessity of recapitulating its facts on every application. All this is very good and tends directly to economy of time and money. The only objection we can see is the difficulty of foreseeing and including in the omnibus summons, as we have termed it, all the requirements which may arise in the progress of the case. At the time discovery is applied for it may be impossible to fix the place where the trial can most conveniently be had, and a subsequent summons might have to be applied for for the latter purpose, at the risk as to costs of the party applying. Still, the Committee would provide that the Master or judge might exercise a discretion as to costs in the case of such subsequent applications, and, on good cause being shown, no doubt injustice might be avoided.

Not only is the number of summonses which either party may take out under the present system a source of oppression, but, as we have before now pointed out, the evil is intensified by the inordinate series of appeals which are open to a party defeated on such summonses—a series of appeals usually quite incommensurate with the importance of the point in question. This the Committee fully recognize, and obviate by providing that there shall be no appeal from a judge at Chambers except in cases of special difficulty and importance, and then only when allowed by the judge himself or by special leave of the Court in banc to which such appeal lies when allowed, limiting such restriction of course to cases of procedure and practice. Akin to the oppression wrought by innumerable summonses at Chambers and persistent appeal therefrom is the abuse of the technical processes known as discovery and interrogatories, by which, as the Committee point out, a man may, on his own mere allegation that he has been wronged by another, put that other to unlimited trouble, annoyance, and expense by compelling him to disclose and produce all documents relating, however remotely, to the matters complained of, and to answer on oath an interminable list of questions administered for his examination. It is true that under the existing system theoretical checks are placed on the unconscientious exercise of powers which are unquestionably necessary and beneficial when properly and fairly utilized; but it has hitherto been incumbent on the party called upon to give discovery of and produce documents, or to answer interrogatories, to show that he ought to be relieved from the burden sought to be imposed upon him, the other party being *prima facie* presumed to be acting within his rights. The Committee would revert to what virtually was the practice prior to the Judicature Acts, and would require the sanction of a Master before such inquisitorial powers are resorted to, imposing, moreover, the costs of such proceedings in the first instance upon the party availing himself of them.

With regard to mode of trial, the recommendations of the Committee foreshadow a startling innovation—nothing less, in fact, than the practical supersession of the British jury. In the ordinary course of affairs the trial will be before a judge alone; either party may, however, apply for a jury, which application may be granted if the questions involved are shown to be such as to render such a tribunal convenient, and in certain cases involving personal character the right of either party to have a jury is to be indisputable. The functions of referees, official and special, are preserved, and those of the former are to be extended so as to enable them to deal more thoroughly with the class of cases usually submitted to them. The provisions with regard to juries we cannot but regard as most salutary. A jury, whether common or special, is at best an unsatisfactory and decaying institution. It possesses no special training, has no interest in deciding the matter rightly, is apt to be wearied by detail and led away by the

eloquence of counsel, while the serving on juries is a perpetual *corvée* on those members of the community who are liable to be summoned. A judge having the decision both of fact and of law in his own hands is manifestly a more competent and expeditious arbitrator, especially as in technical or business matters he may obtain the aid of professional assessors. Another great advantage derivable from the proposed system will be the reduction in the number of those abortive trials which, after all the expense of preparing briefs and so forth, end, as every one has all through seen they must end, in a reference.

Further to discourage trial by jury, the Committee suggest that on every such trial, if the judge certify that he is dissatisfied with the verdict, a new trial shall follow as a matter of course, subject to appeal. This last provision leads up to a very sweeping and salutary reform with relation to motions for new trials and other applications which are now *ex parte* in the first instance, embodied in the 14th and 15th recommendations of the Report. It is an utter absurdity that one party should be allowed, behind the back of the other, to make an application on a statement certainly biased, probably inaccurate, and that then the whole business should be gone through again, in order to afford the opposite party an opportunity of answering, often before judges who have not been present on the previous occasion. All such applications will in future, if the suggestion of the Committee be attended to, be made in the only rational manner—namely, after notice to, and in the hearing of, the other side, who can then and there answer for himself, his presence, moreover, acting as a guard against any flights of fancy on the part of his opponent.

While thus improving the method in which appeals are to be brought before the courts, the Committee seek to reconstitute, on more logical principles, the courts before which such appeals should come. Without disturbing the present arrangement—by which appeals from a judge sitting without a jury go direct to the Court of Appeal, and from jury trials to a Divisional Court—they recommend that, in the latter case, the Divisional Court should consist of three judges, whose decision should be final, except where leave to appeal is given, where there is a difference of opinion, or where the matter at stake exceeds the value of 500*l*. For the hearing of such appeals the strength of the Court of Appeal is to be increased to five members—presumably by borrowing a couple of judges from the Courts below, not by any new appointment of Appellate Judges. This plan would secure a more equal division of work between the Courts in banco, which must necessarily be retained for certain specific purposes, and the Court of Appeal; would avoid the incongruity of three judges in one room being overruled by three judges in another; and would lessen the chances of suitors being driven to the last desperate and ruinous resource of an appeal to the House of Lords. Moreover, the Court in banco being practically equivalent to a Court of Appeal, we should get rid of the anomaly of an extra Court being interposed between a judge and jury and the Court of Appeal; while the same judge sitting alone, or an Equity judge under any circumstances, is only subject to reversal at the hands of the Court of Appeal itself.

The only other point in the Report to which we propose now to refer is that which suggests a lower scale of costs and the prohibition of a special jury in actions where the claim or sum recovered is less than 200*l*. For our own part we would willingly see the experiment tried of relegating such actions to the County Courts, the reasons usually assigned why these tribunals should have Equity jurisdiction so far in excess of their Common Law powers having never struck us as particularly forcible. We are, however, somewhat inclined to yield to the grounds put forward by the Committee in deprecation of such a course—namely, that the increased number of appeals from the County Courts would neutralise the probable benefits, and that the humbler class of litigants, for whom County Courts were primarily established, would be crowded out in such an event.

If the County Courts are not to be resorted to, something must plainly be done in the superior Court, as it is a scandal to justice to hear that "the costs in the smaller actions in the Queen's Bench are often four times larger than the sums in dispute, or even more than this"; and the adoption of a lower scale seems the only practicable remedy. What is to be dreaded is lest the reduction of fees allowed on taxation should drive the smaller litigants to resort to the lower class of solicitors and counsel, in which case it would be small compensation to the clients "to have their causes decided by the best courts and judges in the land." The restriction of appeals from the final judgment of a judge, and the doing away with special juries in these smaller causes, are, however, provisions which can only work for good.

Such, in its main features, is this important Report. Apart from its innate and apparent merits, the position and reputation of the gentlemen who have issued it entitle it to most careful consideration by those to whom it is directly and indirectly addressed. The judges who were not members of the Committee will probably be asked to communicate to the Chancellor their views on the questions involved, and it would be curious and instructive to see the degree of unanimity or dissension thus elicited.

THE AUTHOR OF DON QUIXOTE.

AN essayist might find a good subject on which to dilate in the fostering influence of a country's political importance on the study of its literature by foreigners. Not that the observation is particularly new, for in the way of expostulation it has been made often enough, but the connexion has not been sufficiently recognized as a matter of course. The man of letters who is not free from the faith of fellow-craftsmen in the uses of leather is apt to be indignant when his favourite foreign man of genius is not received on his own merits. He is over prone to forget that the most universal genius cannot be wholly independent of his surroundings, and that without some knowledge of these he is but partially intelligible. But, *pace* the believers in the enlightening influences of trade and travel, it is generally by political events that nations become known to one another. Trade teaches nothing but trade, and it is always the few who travel. It is but a few of the few who travel to any purpose, and it is only one traveller or so in alternate generations who can make that purpose of profit to others. When peaceful intercourse has done its utmost, it is by fighting that nations make one another's acquaintance, or by the war of one of them with a third party under circumstances interesting to the other. Out of the jaws of the lion comes the honey. No doubt the cannon of Van Tromp had something to do with attracting Milton's eye to the literature of Holland. Political importance does not necessarily mean political power, and a country may become important by being fought over. It was while Italy was the interesting victim of Austria and France that its literature was a common object of study, and the Peninsular War was probably the efficient cause of Southey's and Lockhart's studies in Spanish literature. It certainly was the cause of the popular interest in them. Even those writers in whom the interest of the world is permanent, and whom we are all supposed to read, must suffer from the insignificance of their country. Messrs. Nimmo and Bain have just brought out a series of Spanish prose works in a way which curiously illustrates the truth of what we have just said. The works which are contained in this publication are not Spanish without exception, for three of the twelve volumes are devoted to *Gil Blas*, which belongs to Spain very much as a certain gentleman who lately chose to appear in the bull-ring did—in dress namely, and in nothing else. But the others are at least Spanish in origin. It is typical that it is not possible to speak of the nationality even of these without qualification; for, with the exception of *Don Quixote* and the *Lozarrillo de Tormes*, they are presented here, not as they appear in the original, but as they were recast by Le Sage.

The predominance of the French writer is itself a proof of the little attention now given to Spanish literature for its own sake, but it is almost inevitable. In one case, however, the publishers have gone out of their way to prove how little care and scholarship it is thought necessary to show in editing a Spaniard. The series includes—and what series of Spanish romances could help including?—*Don Quixote*, and the masterpiece of Cervantes is treated as no publisher bringing out a fine edition would venture to treat a French or German writer. When Messrs. Nimmo and Bain resolved to reprint *Gil Blas* they obviously felt that some discrimination must be exercised. A competent editor must be obtained for one thing, and they must entrust the task of writing the introductory essay on Le Sage to a master of French literature. Accordingly, Le Sage's writing and recastings of other men's writing are treated in an essay by Mr. Saintsbury. Very different is the measure meted out to Cervantes. We might add, and to Diego de Mendoza or Mateo Aleman; but, as we do not propose to deal at present with any of these twelve finely got-up volumes, except the *Don Quixote*, we shall at present confine ourselves to Cervantes. It is, perhaps, inevitable that the translation given should be the inaccurate version of Motteux; but it is a grievous blemish to a fine edition like this that the only Life of Cervantes which Messrs. Nimmo and Bain could bring themselves to give should be the short and inaccurate notice by Lockhart. The absurdity is heightened by the fact that we have a Life of Motteux, apparently written for the occasion, by Mr. Henri Van Laun, in which the obscure life and ignoble death of the translator are detailed at rather greater length than the career of Cervantes. We have no wish to speak with disrespect of Lockhart's work. Writing while much that is now known was still undiscovered, and necessarily perhaps guided only by Juan Pellicer and Vicente de los Rios, the mistakes he made were unavoidable. The translator of the Spanish Ballads had at least some original knowledge of the country and the language of the man he was writing about. He did not compile his Life, with no apparent knowledge of Spanish, from a contemporary French writer, like the author of a recent work intended to introduce this foreign classic to English readers. The amount of sagacity and force of thought he brought to the writing of this Life gives it even now a certain independent value. But all this does not excuse Messrs. Nimmo and Bain for not at least attempting to give the purchasers of their twelve handsome volumes the results of recent research. No contemporary student of Spanish literature occupies the critical position of Mr. Saintsbury, but surely somebody might have been found to state known facts in readable English.

This is the less intelligible because there has lately been something like a revival of interest in Cervantes. A new translation of *Don Quixote* has been published, and has been sufficiently criticized. Much, indeed, of the criticism was not of a kind to encourage high estimates of what would have been the value of any

new essay devoted to him. Mr. Duffield, the author of the translation—obviously undertaken as a labour of love—has himself departed as widely as possible from the truth in his estimate of Cervantes. He has, in the face of all the evidence, chosen to represent him as a political and religious reformer; and he has, as we took occasion to point out, fallen into many and serious mistakes in matters of fact. But we doubt whether his severest critics have formed a much more accurate idea of the author of *Don Quixote*. Both have persistently treated him, though from slightly different, and, in spite of great apparent divergencies, not more than slightly different points of view, as if he had stood wholly apart from his time and his people. When Mr. Duffield represents Cervantes as the preacher of a cunningly disguised attack on the Inquisition, he is advancing an opinion which it is scarcely necessary to confute; but the author of an article in *Blackwood*, written for the purpose of exposing Mr. Duffield's many errors, is scarcely nearer the truth when he speaks of Cervantes as "the least fanatical of men, who had a charity large enough to embrace within its loving fold Turk, Moor, Englishman, even Portuguese—God's creatures, of whom none of his contemporaries had a good word to say." What is seemingly equally incredible to them all is that Miguel de Cervantes was a Spanish gentleman of the sixteenth century, with the ideas and beliefs of other Spanish gentlemen, and differing from them only—and the difference is ample—in being a great genius. It is a sign of that little knowledge of Spain of which we have already spoken that this want of scientific method, which would not be allowed in dealing with a great Frenchman or German, still obtains in treating of Cervantes. A great discoverer lately published a work in five volumes to demonstrate the existence of a new nation. It consisted, if we mistake not, of a chosen people walking about unrecognized among men, but to be known to the initiated by a mark like watered yellow silk on the left hip. In the times of critical ignorance before Sainte-Beuve, men of genius were apparently considered to form a people by themselves, somewhat in this way. More scientific ideas have slowly made their way into criticism, but *Don Quixote* and the region round him in literature are as yet unsubdued by them. To this still-enduring state of anarchy is perhaps due the fact that the bad and foolish commentators of Cervantes are treated by every new writer on him with a degree of respect never shown to the writers of folly about other great authors. They are, as if it had become a routine, noticed, confuted, or ridiculed; whereas, if the victim of their folly had been Shakespeare, or Rabelais, they would simply be left alone.

Meanwhile the consecrated commonplaces about the author of *Don Quixote* are repeated without any apparent desire to weigh their value; and these may be said to group themselves under three heads—that he was left in a state of poverty disgraceful to his country; that he abolished books of chivalry; and that he was exceptionally ill-treated by the publication of Avellaneda's false second part of *Don Quixote*. It is impossible to enter on a detailed examination of these questions here, but we may state a few reasons for showing why the popular verdict on every one of them should be reversed. As regards his poverty, we cannot, with a respect for Cervantes as deep as that of any of his admirers, see why he should have been other than poor. He was born the younger son of a gentleman of small estate, like hundreds of others for whom their country has not been held bound to provide. His wound at Lepanto and his captivity in Algiers were misfortunes he shared with many of his countrymen. It was the natural course of things that he should not have been paid for his military services. Madrid, as every reader of the picaresque novels, of books of travel in Spain, and of *Gil Blas* knows, was full of retired officers trying to get their pay—their strict due in arrears—far into the seventeenth century. Cervantes was not even an officer; and Philip II., like our own Elizabeth, habitually left his soldiers to starve when he had got the fighting he needed out of them. Neither can we acknowledge that, as a man of letters, Cervantes was treated with the injustice so often complained of. If Spain were inclined to justify herself for her treatment of her greatest man, we are of opinion that she would have a very good case. Cervantes did not begin serious literary work till he was nearly forty. The first part of *Don Quixote* did not appear till he was fifty-six. It had an immediate success, passing through eight editions in six years. There is evidence that the latter years of Cervantes were passed in easier circumstances. Before the appearance of *Don Quixote*, in 1605, he had produced nothing, except the *Numancia*, of permanent value; and men of genius, like other men, cannot be considered entitled to be paid for their work till it is done. Moreover—as Sainte-Beuve, in that essay on Cervantes which shows how nearly a fine critical faculty will atone for want of knowledge of a language, well says—the author of *Don Quixote* was probably too proud a man to succeed by the smaller arts of life. We have his own confession in the *Viage al Parnaso*, that he himself "had forged his own fortune," and when we remember that it could scarcely have been made different except by dependence on a patron, those who love his memory will not wish it had been otherwise. The other accepted tradition about him, that he ruined the books of chivalry, is even more baseless. It would be infinitely more accurate to say that, because the books of chivalry were becoming ridiculous, therefore *Don Quixote* was written. Much might be cited in support of this opinion—which, in this crude form, is very far from being ours—but one consideration will, we think, show that the services of Cervantes to literature, in abolishing the tales of knight-errantry, have been wholly misunderstood; that he has been praised for what is not his true glory, and for what he never did.

The true successors and conquerors of the tales of chivalry were the picaresque novels. The first of these, the *Lazarillo*, had appeared more than seventy years before, and the second, *Guzman de Alfarache*, the father of a longer line than that of *Amadis*, in 1599, six years before *Don Quixote*, and with immediate acceptance. The mention of *Guzman de Alfarache* brings us to the third of our ungrounded traditions—the exceptional ill-conduct of the so-called Avellaneda. That this literary scamp, whoever he was, did tag a very vulgar, worthless production, full of malignant personalities, on to the first part of *Don Quixote*, is very true. But a dishonest Valencian had done as much for Mateo Aleman and the first part of his *Guzman de Alfarache*. Others had tried their hand at continuing the *Lazarillo de Tormes* of Diego de Mendoza. This writing of false second parts was a common literary offence of that day. Avellaneda's case has received much more attention from writers about Cervantes than it deserves. There are subjects which are not exhausted by a long series of competent studies; there are others which, after being handled again and again, are still to do. A satisfactory biographical and critical work on Cervantes is, as yet, unhappily among the latter.

VOLUNTARY AND SCHOOL BOARD SCHOOLS.

THE review of the year's work which the Chairman of the London School Board gave at the first meeting of the Board after the holidays contained one remarkable passage. "We are not anxious," he said, "but quite the reverse, to have voluntary schools transferred to us." Mr. Buxton's disclaimer would probably be shared by most of his fellow chairmen. The School Boards do not, as a rule, care to have any more responsibility thrown on them. So long as the voluntary schools are disposed to bear their part of the educational burden they will be quite welcome to do so. That the voluntary schools are disposed to do this there can be no question. Canon Gregory has a right to feel proud when he looks at the results of the first ten years of the Elementary Education Act. The clergy of the Church of England can boast that when the trial came upon them they gave themselves up neither to despair nor to presumption. It seemed as though only a miracle could save their schools from extinction; but they went on working and hoping as though the issue depended only on themselves. To make their labour fruitful it was necessary that their subscribers should go on keeping up the Church school as an act of grace when they were obliged to keep up a Board school as an act of necessity. It was hard to believe beforehand that any considerable number of people would do this. Perhaps the laity, speaking generally, did not believe it. They thought that year by year the voluntary schools would decrease in number, in size, in efficiency, until at last the School Board schools would cover the whole educational field. But the clergy were not dismayed even by the discouragement of the laity. They knew that this discouragement, if it continued, would be fatal to their schools; but they determined with themselves that it should not continue. How they managed to get rid of it is even now a mystery; but there is no doubt whatever that they did get rid of it. To all appearance, voluntary schools never stood on a better or a more promising footing than they do now. The Elementary Education Act has been in full work for more than ten years, and School Boards have been formed and have built schools all over the country. But their success has not been won at the cost of the voluntary schools. Here and there, indeed, a voluntary school may have found the rivalry of a School Board school too severe to stand up against, but this has been merely an accident. The School Board school has, in such cases, been better, or better placed; it has enjoyed, in fact, some specific superiority which would equally have given it the victory if it had been another voluntary school. But, taking the country as a whole, voluntary schools may face all the tests which can be applied to them without any uneasiness as to the result. They have been subjected to a trial of extraordinary severity, and in no single respect have they been found wanting. If we are asked to say why things have turned out in this way, it is not at all easy to suggest a satisfactory answer. To some extent, of course, religious enthusiasm has been the cause; but this is certainly not the sole reason. The difference between the religious teaching given at an average Board school and the religious teaching given at an average voluntary school is not great enough to dispose the large indifferentist class to pay twice over in order to keep the voluntary school going. Where the School Board happens to be specially hostile to religion, or where the religious instruction given in the voluntary school is of an unusually decided type, it is intelligible that the supporters of the voluntary school should feel that the object to be gained by keeping the voluntary school going is worth any sacrifice that may be necessary to bring it about. But a very ordinary case is that, though the religious teaching given at the School Board school is somewhat more general and less decided than the religious teaching given at the voluntary school, the difference is rather in degree than in kind, and what the average Englishman regards as of most importance may be taken to be present in both. As an explanation of the readiness which the laity have shown to support voluntary schools, the theory that it springs exclusively from religious enthusiasm is insufficient.

The present prosperity of voluntary schools may in part be regarded as an example of the national love of fighting. If the

ground had been entirely unoccupied, School Board schools might have had everything their own way. The division between religious and secular instruction might then have been dictated by reasons of pure convenience, and there might have been obvious advantages in an arrangement which grouped children together for the purpose of secular instruction, while keeping them separate for the purpose of religious instruction. But the ground had not been unoccupied. It had been held to a large extent by voluntary schools; and when the supporters of these schools found their territory invaded by a rival created by Act of Parliament, they felt a natural disposition to show that they could hold their own against him. It is not unfair to suppose that this feeling had a large part in keeping up, and even increasing, the subscription paid to voluntary schools. No man likes to feel that the work he has been doing for a long time and at a considerable sacrifice to himself is to be taken out of his hands and committed to a public authority. Even if the work in question is to be carried on in precisely the same spirit and by the same methods as before, he will be apt to resent the change. The truth of this was seen a year or two back in the attitude of the county magistracy towards the Prisons' Bill. Yet here the Visiting Justices had not been spending their own money in carrying out their ideas. They had merely administered a public fund in their character as a public authority, and they had no real cause to resent the transfer of their duties to another public authority. But in the case of voluntary schools the managers had come forward of their own free will to undertake a duty which every public authority had been content to neglect. It was perfectly natural, therefore, that they should see in the creation of a new public authority to do the work that they had been doing both a slight and a challenge. They were not, as in the case of the prison authorities, compelled to hand over their schools to the School Boards; on the contrary, they were expressly invited to do their utmost to rival the School Boards. They would have been less than Englishmen if they had refused such an invitation. They may not have cared greatly for the difference between the two schools; it was enough that the one school had been founded and maintained by themselves, while the other had been founded and was to be maintained in opposition to them. If they had allowed their subscriptions to the voluntary school to go unpaid, they would have held it equivalent to a cowardly surrender of the position they had so long maintained; and on this ground, if on no other, they were determined to show that, though the School Board could compel them to pay the school rate, it could not forbid them to pay the voluntary subscription which was to render the rate unnecessary. To a feeling of this kind the second decade of the Education Act is likely to prove a more serious ordeal than the first. The excitement on both sides will have cooled down; those who are genuinely interested in education will, in consequence of this cooling down, have become the moving spirits of the School Boards; and the fact that the School Board schools were originally set up as rivals to the voluntary schools will have faded from recollection. Keen as the rapture of the strife may be in the first instance, it sometimes grows weaker as the fight goes on, and the more so if it is obvious that the other side is ready and even anxious to come to terms. In the presence of these new influences will voluntary schools continue to hold their own against School Board schools? Ten years ago it seemed unlikely that they would do so; but, as that doubt proved to be without foundation, it is safer and certainly more graceful to assume that what has happened once will happen again, and that Canon Gregory's song of triumph will be sung with as much reason in 1891 as in 1881.

At all events, it is sincerely to be hoped that this will be the case. This implies no view for or against the possibility of combining definite religious instruction with the general acceptance of the School Board system. The reason which, even if it stood alone, would be sufficient to make the prosperity of voluntary schools a matter of just satisfaction, is of a simpler kind. They are, as a matter of fact, more humanizing, both as regards teachers and children, than School Boards are—perhaps than School Boards can be. The interest which the clergy take in the parish school is not limited to the actual school work. They regard the children as something more than so many machines for earning the Parliamentary grant, and the teachers as something more than so many machines for qualifying the children to earn the Parliamentary grant. Here and there no doubt the managers of a School Board school may also be anxious to take this wider view of their functions. In the majority of cases, however, they regard themselves simply as the representatives of the ratepayers—bound indeed to do their best to make the school efficient, but having neither the right nor the wish to know anything either of the children or teachers, except in the hours during which they are within the school precincts and engaged in the school work. Even in the exceptional cases they are hampered by the absence of any relationship or permanent official standing outside the school to which they can appeal with any confidence. They know nothing of the children's parents or homes; they never see the teachers, unless when they are actually engaged in teaching. The clergy and the managers of voluntary schools generally stand in a different position. The parsonage is the place to which the parents naturally go for help and advice in anything that concerns their children, and the place to which the teachers naturally go for help and advice in anything that concerns themselves. In so far as the other managers are really identified with the school they become in these respects a kind of supplementary clergy. Thus an

interest grows up between the managers on the one hand and the children and teachers on the other which is human as well as professional. As such it may be of very great value in bringing classes together. In a School Board school this uniting influence is in a great degree wanting. The efforts that the better managers of School Board schools are constantly making to bridge across the interval which divides them from those with whom they have to do are evidence of this. It is scarcely possible to suggest any really appropriate remedy for this state of things, and so long as none is forthcoming it is permissible to hope that voluntary schools will continue to multiply and prosper.

ANGLING LITERATURE.

WITH the first of October begins the winter of the angler's discontent, that is, if he be a trout-fisher. In late rivers salmon may still be taken, and the grayling, that flower-like fish, as St. Ambrose calls him, is in season in early winter. Of coarse fish, from pike downwards, we do not speak, and might say, with Gay—

I never wander where the bodd'ring reeds
O'erlook the muddy stream, whose tangling weeds
Perplex the fisher.
Nor trowle for pikes, discompleers of the lake.

The end of September is late enough, in all conscience, for trout-fishing. A writer in the *Times* of October 13 is wrong in his remark that "in the end of summer and in autumn, when the majority of fishers are forced to take their annual holiday, there is little to be done except after a spate, and then the use of the odious worm must be resorted to as the only profitable lure." This authority can know little of his subject—trout-fishing in Scotland. The fact is that the warm soft days of September breed myriads of beautiful water-flies, and the trout rise eagerly at the fly, in favourable conditions, at certain times of the day. They rather prefer a glimpse of the sun, and their hours for feeding are usually about noon-tide, and about three o'clock in the early afternoon. But, though you may see the Tweed, overfished as it is, or the Nith, all a-boil with the rising of good trout, they "bite short" very often, and do not take the fly with the rush which a sea-trout makes, or which even yellow trout make in spring. Hence many disappointments, and persons of short temper may be heard, if not actually using profane language, certainly "aiming at a swear," as the Scotch gamekeeper said. With all its disappointments, autumn fly-fishing, especially when the waters are at all coloured, is infinitely preferable to the use of "the odious worm." Even if we agree with Mr. Darwin that the worm is apt to wriggle more than his bodily sufferings justify, he is a dirty and unsportsmanlike lure. But autumn fly-fishing "yet is dear, the fishing of the later year, as not unlike the sport of spring." The March-brown revisits his vernal haunts—the March-brown, or a fly so like him, that trout rise at the artificial imitation. There is a melancholy beauty in the autumn woods, but the yellow leaves, floating down the stream, get caught in one's flies, and give a great deal of trouble. This is one sign that the game is up, and the lank forms and comparatively languid struggles of the larger trout warn the angler to reel up his line for the last time—its music is a sound as "sad and sweet" as any enumerated by Tennyson. One looks upon the happy autumn fields, and is obliged to think of "the days which are no more," the days before there was a Galashiels weaver on every pool and stream by day, and a detachment of poachers netting all up and down the river by night.

The end of all things comes, and when the angler reaches town he probably begins to collect angling literature. For some reason anglers are often bibliophiles, and in the old booksellers' catalogues there are almost as many books named under the head "Angling" as under "Cruikshank" or "America." For the pleasure of Anglo-bibliomaniacs Mr. Osmond Lambert has published a little volume on *Angling Literature* (Sampson Low), from which we may confess that we have stolen our references to Gay and to St. Ambrose. Mr. Lambert's little book is a series of unsystematized notes and quotations, which are interesting to a desultory reader. He does not profess to have drawn up a complete bibliography of works on the gentle craft, but he tells his readers where such bibliographies are to be found. We do not observe that he even mentions Stoddart's various and very interesting volumes, which may be often picked up cheap on London bookstalls. *The Moor and the Loch*, that unfailing source of instruction and amusement, does not appear in his index. Before turning to Mr. Lambert's interesting, though too brief, account of fishing in the ancient world, we must mention that his volume is bound in that stiffish sort of parchment cover with which we are familiar in "The Parchment Library." It seems almost certain that this kind of cover for books, as distinguished from the absolutely limp and thin parchment binding imitated from the French style, is a failure. Mr. Lambert's work already gapes fearfully, with covers all twisted and awry, and presents a gruesome resemblance to the mouth of a pike which has been too long out of water. And to gape in this unseemly sort is only the usual custom of books got up in this kind of parchment cover. Where so much pains has been taken with type and with paper, it is a pity that all should be spoiled by a style of binding which is neither pretty nor permanent. A volume like Mr. Blades's *Enemies of Books*, on the other hand, never gapes, however assiduously it may be handled.

Mr. Lambert has a good deal to say about the antiquities of angling. The sport in Egypt he leaves on one side, with only a passing allusion. The monuments have plenty to tell us about angling in the land of Nile. On a wall at Thebes we see a river-boat, in which one man is hauling at a net, while four others, who seem to be wading, are helping him. The net is full of big fishes, and a kite sits on the mast of the boat, looking out for the entrails of the fish, which the sportsmen throw to her. In Thebes, too, is a design of an Egyptian bottom-fisher. He sits in an uncomfortable dining-room chair, and his rod is about four feet long. A gigantic butterfly (in spite of Dr. Stephani, who can see no butterflies in ancient art) is watching his proceedings. In another picture the angler has dragged out a fish of about four pounds weight, with a line about two feet long. But, if the Egyptian rod and line were short, the landing net was immense. Many of the fish which they caught the Egyptians refused to eat, under the pretence that a portion of the dismembered Osiris had been devoured by fishes. At Oxyrhynchus the people declined to taste the fish of that name, and this prejudice still prevails in Upper Egypt. The upper classes in ancient times preferred the use of the *leister*, or fish-spear, to that of the rod and line. Homer has not very much to say about angling. His heroes never ate fish, except when they were positively compelled by hunger to go angling "with bent hooks." This reminds us that Mr. Lambert might have told us something about hooks, from the flint ones of the Mentone bone-caves, and the mother of pearl articles of the South Seas, to that curious ancient bronze hook, already notable for "the Limerick bend," which is figured in Mr. Evans's book on implements of bronze. In one passage, to return to Homer, the author of the *Odyssey* (xii. 234, 257) makes an obscure allusion to what seems to have been a way of securing the line against the bites of fishes. Mr. Currey translates the passage thus:—"As when upon a point of rock a fisherman with long rod, letting down baits to delude the little fish, casts forth into the deep the horns of the shelterless ox, and then, when he has caught one, throws it struggling ashore." The theory is that a small tube of the horn of the shelterless ox was run upon the line. Clearly to toss a whole horn of a shelterless ox into the water would be to startle fish even as guileless and uneducated as the trout of Canadian or Finnish rivers.

Ausonius, in his *Mosella*, proves himself to have been well acquainted with trout and grayling. In his time the fish could be described as *ignara doli*. Now they are pretty wide-awake. Ausonius thus describes the sensation caused by a fish's first struggle:—

Crispique tremori
Vibrantis setæ nutans consentit harundo.

"Striking" was not what old Younger says it should be, a mere "feel" at the fish, a movement not nearly strong enough to lift the line out of the water. Ausonius struck with a swish:—

Nec mora: et excussam stridentem verbera prædam
Dextera in obliquum raptat puer; excipit ictum
Spiritus, ut fractis quondam per inane flagellis
Aura crepat, motoque adsibilat aere ventus.

Ausonius tells us that he has seen trout, even after they were landed, collect their forces, and spring aloft, and fling their curved bodies headlong into the stream below, and regain enjoyment of the waters lost to hope, while after them the fisherman wildly leaps,

et stolido capnat prensare natatu.

One has occasionally lost a trout for want of a landing-net when half his body was already lying on the grass at the water's edge. Dean Swift said that a boyish disappointment of this kind soured him for life. But we have never known a regularly-landed fish make off in the manner vividly described by Ausonius.

The earliest classical account of fly-fishing is given in Aelian's book, *De Naturâ Animalium*, which was written in the middle of the third century of our era. As the passage is more often alluded to than quoted in full, we give it as it is rendered by Mr. Lambert:—

I have heard of a Macedonian way of catching fish, and it is this: between Beroea and Thessalonica runs a river called the Astracus, and in it there are fish with spotted (or speckled) skins; what the natives of the country call them you had better ask the Macedonians. These fish feed on a fly which is peculiar to the country, and which hovers over the river. It is not like flies found elsewhere, nor does it resemble a wasp in appearance, nor in shape would one justly describe it as a midge or a bee, yet it has something of each of these. In boldness it is like a fly, in size you might call it a bee, it imitates the colour of the wasp, and it hums like a bee. The natives call it the Hippourus. As these flies seek their food over the river, they do not escape the observation of the fish swimming below. When then a fish observes a fly hovering above, it swims quietly up, fearing to agitate the water, lest it should scare away its prey, then coming up by its shadow, it opens its jaws and gulps down the fly, like a wolf carrying off a sheep from the flock, or an eagle a goose from the farm-yard; having done this, it withdraws under the rippling water. Now though the fishermen know of this, they do not use these flies at all for bait for the fish; for if a man's hand touch them, they lose their colour, their wings decay, and they become unfit for food for the fish. For this reason they have nothing to do with them, hating them for their bad character; but they have planned a snare for the fish, and get the better of them by their fisherman's craft. They fasten red (crimson-red) wool round a hook and fit on to the wool two feathers which grow under a cock's wattles, and which in colour are like wax. Their rod is six feet long and the line is of the same length. Then they throw their snare, and the fish attracted and maddened by the colour comes up, thinking, from the pretty sight, to get a dainty mouthful; when, however, it opens its jaws, it is caught by the hook and enjoys a bitter repast, a captive.

Whatever the natural fly may have been (some travelled angler might still find it on the water), it is clear that the imitation was a red palmer, with a red body. Aelian must surely have underrated the length of rod and line, unless, indeed, the Macedonians merely "dibbled," as is now, we believe, practised by persons who joy in the capture of chub.

The fly must have been a queer one which was partly like a midge and not dissimilar from a blue-bottle, while closely resembling a bee. There is very good fishing now in Illyrian waters, and it might repay an angler to try a red palmer in Bulgarian streams, and to watch the methods of the natives. These change little in remote districts, and the *hippouros* may still be a favourite fly in the streams of the Rhodope.

CRITICS AND TEACHERS OF MUSIC.

THERE seems to exist, even among those who are qualified to speak upon the subject, a more than vague idea as to the duties of a musical critic. In a recent work on *Phases of Musical England* (Remington and Co.), the author, Mr. Crowest, devotes his first chapter to the subject, in which, after delivering a philippic against modern musical criticism, we are told that the musical critic should be a guide "who, having a greater knowledge of, and sympathy with, his subject, and seeing more keenly than the general public the varied picturesqueness, which his superior imaginative faculty readily traces, is well able to bring home to the eyes and senses of those who are content to follow him in his critical peregrinations aspects and views which the transient glance of the unaccustomed eye could scarcely be expected to realize." This theory that the critic should be a public expositor of musical ideas Mr. F. Hueffer, in a lecture which he delivered on the subject, seemed rather to combat; for, as we understood him, it was, he thought, the public who, by their increased interest in matters musical, were to force the critics to provide better criticism, and thereby to encourage musicians to aim at a higher standard of art. Mr. Edmund Gurney, that master of musical mysticism who is tempted at times, as he recently told us in his ponderous volume on the *Power of Sound*, to tear up lamp-posts in the street when he was under the influence of certain musical passages, regards the critic as a simple interpreter, who "may really fulfil the enviable part of making others see and appreciate marvels otherwise quite beyond their ken"; whilst some again, perhaps with reason, look upon musical criticism as a pestilence, and warn people, in the words of Byron, as soon to "Believe a woman, or an epitaph, Or any other thing that's false," as trust a critic; or, with Robert Schumann, contemptuously advise the herd to "pick out the fifths" and leave interpretation alone.

It would seem then, according to these authorities, that the musical critic should be either one of these four things—a teacher, interpreter, or pupil of the public on the one hand, or a curious collector of hidden and consecutive fifths on the other. Of one matter, however, all these authorities are sure, and that is that the musical critic, as he at present exists, is thoroughly incompetent. Mr. Crowest's strictures upon the incompetent teacher are not without reason, and all the more so as from his point of view these "form a large majority of those who write on the subject of music." It is true that many of the criticisms instanced by him are only guilty of the sin of indirectness of speech, and, as he objects, revel in "a studied avoidance of all references which may provoke argument or lead to retort" by "the use of broad general statements which cover everything and yet mean nothing"; but Mr. Crowest has met with criticisms in which "Beethoven's sonata in three sharps" is spoken of as if there were only one of them, and others where "light tenors are described as baritones"; and on one occasion, though it has nothing to do with criticism, he has come across a certain artist "who occupies the highest place in his profession at the present day, who had not only never read *Sartor Resartus*," but was also ignorant of the existence of its author. Indirectness in criticism is blamable perhaps, but if directness were practised in such a manner as Mr. Crowest advocates, we fear that the "retort" it might lead to would be an action for libel, and the incompetent critic may justly plead that he would rather veil his meaning in "broad general statements" than bring himself, even for the sake of the divine art of which he knows nothing, under the tender mercies of a court of justice. The form of criticism which Mr. Crowest describes as the "left-nothing-to-be-desired" style is at any rate harmless, whereas that of the musical Bonapartes is open to certain inconveniences which the incompetent one can hardly be blamed for avoiding. Our critic of critics objects rightly to the abuse of technical terms which only puzzle the unenlightened, and serve but poorly to hide the ignorance of the writer, and what he says of the acquirements necessary to a right exercise of the critical function is undoubtedly just; but we think, nevertheless, that the "life or death of Music as an art" is not in the hands of the critics, as he suggests, or at any rate not exclusively in their hands. Let those who have the education of the youth of the country in matters musical—those who by their direct personal influence can mould the taste and appreciations of future generations—we mean the professional teachers of music, of which class Mr. Crowest himself is a member, begin to set their house in order, and they will find that the much-abused musical

critic will, so far as his incompetent pen will allow him, support their endeavours. If teachers of music will persist in training their pupils, as the majority do, to play a class of music which is avowedly written for "the pot," to use a homely phrase (meaningless fantasias so called, or graceless gavottes written by themselves), instead of leading them to interest themselves in the works of the great masters of music, how can they possibly expect the best of musical critics, whose only medium of instruction is printer's ink and paper, to excite any enthusiasm, or even to be fairly understood when he writes? To give an example, which is within the experience of hundreds, if not of thousands, of fathers of families in England. A new teacher of music is introduced to undertake the musical education of, say, the eldest daughter in a well-to-do family. The pupil has to a certain degree mastered the elements, and can play one of the easier of Mozart's sonatas on the pianoforte, which she does before her new instructor. With a somewhat ambiguous motion of head, the teacher expresses himself pleased with the performance so far as it has gone, but (and upon this *but* very often hangs the future of the art, so far as the pupil is concerned) there are some things which must be corrected immediately, and he would recommend a course tending to give greater execution, &c. &c., and on his next visit he produces a senseless fantasia, pleasing, as he describes it, and full of just those passages calculated to perfect the pupil in the art of pianoforte-playing. This work, if it does not prove to be the composition of the master himself, is at any rate published by a house which will allow a commission on each piece of music allotted by the teacher; and for this reason it is foisted upon the unwilling pupil, who, disgusted by it, ends in course of time by becoming a mere machine as incapable of expressing the thoughts of a composer as a parrot or Messrs. Maskelyne and Cooke's automatic trumpeter. When teachers of music, as we have said, give up the merciless system of education that is generally practised by them, and revert to a more healthy and reasonable method, then the critics may be blamed for not carrying on by their criticisms the education which tends to the purification of modern musical taste in England. We are perfectly willing to admit that there are teachers who scorn to employ this method, and who spend their time, too often vainly, in endeavouring to nourish a taste for that which is pure and good in music; but the example given above is surely not an unfair one.

In having said thus much we are by no means to be understood to defend that class of critics which it has pleased Mr. Crowest to attack, but simply to protest that the future of musical art in England, so far as that future depends upon public taste, is not even mainly in the hands of the critics. There is little doubt that much of the so-called musical criticism of the daily and weekly press is unworthy of its name, and that it is little more than the chronicle of the small beer of the musical world; but it can hardly be said that such judgments will affect the future of the art or that it is worth the ink used in denunciation of it. For instance, those critics who saw anything to praise in the late operatic season have their own reward. If, as we should judge by some of their writings, it was worthy of record at all, they will have plenty to pass their criticisms upon in seasons to come. The duty, as it seems to us, of that class of modern musical critic which Mr. Crowest so vigorously attacks lies more in taking care that the public receives its money's worth, and that the promises of *impresarii* and concert-givers should be fulfilled, than in undertaking public education in matters musical. The truth is that the genuine musical critic has but a small public, to which, as a rule, he faithfully addresses himself; and the smallness of this public arises from the fact that few have been rightly educated on his subject-matter so as to understand what he is talking about. This, as we have shown above, is purely the fault of the professional teacher; and it is he, and not the critics, that should bear the blame. It is all very well to set up the chronicler of musical events as a musical critic, and then demolish him with the heavy artillery of censure; but this seems to us to be a somewhat unfair method of dealing with him. We could multiply indefinitely the instances of so-called musical critics who expose their ignorance in public prints; but that would not show that there are not many really learned men who endeavour to do all they can to encourage the art. Had Mr. Crowest shown that those who are really worthy the name of critic were abusing the power entrusted to them, there would be cause for regret; but he has made the error—a grave one, we think—of mistaking the journalist, whose duty it is to chronicle events, for the musician, who comments upon the works performed. It is unnecessary to point out here who are the true musical critics, as their names will rise spontaneously to the memories of all interested in music. Dr. Hueffer's theory, that the critic should be the pupil of the public, is based on the same error, although he seems to have the law of supply and demand upon his side; for, if the public will demand more intelligent notices, doubtless they will in time get them. If there is a real desire for increased musical literature, we may yet see a newspaper similar to the great German newspapers devoted entirely to music and to that genuine musical criticism which these authorities aver does not exist in England. Mr. Gurney's interpreter has already an existence in the compilers of analytical programmes, which seem so necessary at modern concerts, but he is not, and, from the fact of his being an interpreter, cannot be, a critic; whilst Schumann's collector of fifths, it is hardly necessary to point out, would soon die out under the law of the survival of the fittest. The musical

future of England does not so much depend upon the ability of musical critics as upon the exertions of those professors and teachers of music who have such great opportunities of cultivating the taste of the rising generation.

THE MODERN ROUGH.

THE rough is one of the latest developments of modern society, and he is asserting himself at the present moment in a very remarkable manner. We do not mean to say that brutality is a recent invention; history bristles with incidents in which ruffianism and disregard for human suffering are the predominating characteristics; but, as history for the most part recounts only the deeds of those of "gentle blood," the acts of violence have generally had the sanction of war or political necessity. In England a certain brutal element has always existed amongst the unlettered rustic and mining population; Hodge is much given to correcting the partner of his joys and sorrows; and the miner is notorious for "heaving half a brick" at a stranger, or backing his dog Rose to fight a Bishop; while "puncing" is a recognized form of popular amusement in Lancashire, boots and clogs being tipped with pointed iron for the express purpose of kicking out the brains of their owners' fellow-citizens. But the rough as we, or rather the police-courts, are familiar with him here is "a rabbit of quite a different species," as the French quaintly say, and deserves especial study. His favourite amusement is to assemble in crowds in places where respectable people do mostly congregate, and there to use unseemly language and assault the passers-by. For the existence of the rough in his earlier stages of development there may be some explanation, though certainly no excuse. Like Talleyrand's beggar, he would probably plead that "one must live"; but we should be inclined to retort, with the celebrated diplomatist, that "we do not see the necessity." He may be only struggling in his way to emancipate himself from the dull monotony of poverty and its surroundings, and his eccentricities may, after all, be nothing more than the effervescence of youthful spirits. He has not football or lawn-tennis for a recreation, like his betters; therefore he contents himself with the hat of the passer-by, deftly knocked off to serve him for a ball. His taste for harmony is gratified by howling the refrain of some ribald music-hall song through the streets on Sunday nights; and his martial ardour is appeased by an attack upon the policeman on the beat, when authority is generally at a disadvantage of twenty or thirty to one. But, although the rough is to be accounted for, he is not to be tolerated, and the problem of abolishing him is one which must before long be seriously considered.

Any assembly of a religious nature appears to have a great attraction for the rough. It is perhaps unwise to attempt to convert a street-corner into a temporary camp-meeting; but such an error in judgment is no excuse for "bonneting" the preacher and kicking those who choose to stop and listen to his exhortations. Such aggressive movements as the Salvation Army no doubt provoke a great deal of antagonism; but, whatever may be thought of the prudence of their promoters, violent assaults upon them are inexcusable, and yet they cannot show their faces or sing their somewhat eccentric hymns in public without the risk of being attacked in the most brutal fashion with sticks and stones and opprobrious language. A recent order issued by the Home Office, however, makes the Salvation Army the offender, as provoking a breach of the peace, and, as we have a deep respect for constituted authority, we will not base our appeal for the repression of the rough upon his offences against these enthusiasts. We do, however, insist that a peaceful religious community worshipping according to their lights in their own licensed chapel ought not to have their gas turned out and their officials severely maltreated, yet this is what has occurred this week. Five Islington rowdies were charged at Clerkenwell police-court with violently assaulting one James Green by striking him on the head with sticks. A carman who was passing along Morton Road on Sunday night saw a gang of youths in and around the lobby at the Congregational Church in that thoroughfare. The gas was put out, and on one of the officials attempting to relight it and repress the disturbance, he was knocked down, beaten with sticks, and rendered insensible. The prisoners had used foul language, and one of them had threatened to knock out the eyes of the prosecutor, who, although he has thus far escaped absolute blinding, was confined to his bed for five days, and is still unable to see with the left eye. It is satisfactory to find that Mr. Hosack showed his disapprobation of the gang's proceedings by committing the members for trial. At Southwark, too, the magistrate seems to think that something ought to be done, for he has sentenced several street brawlers to terms of imprisonment varying from three to four months, with hard labour, for organized violent conduct in the public streets. At Marylebone a month's imprisonment has been thought sufficient for a similar offence.

The Clerkenwell roughs exhibit their keen but rude sense of humour in a very characteristic manner. Only the other day several persons were charged with disorderly conduct in Pentonville Road. The evidence proved that scarcely a week has passed without charges being heard at the Clerkenwell Court of assaults by disorderly gangs of roughs, who are in the habit of parading the streets of Islington on Sundays, amusing themselves by engaging in free fights, and assaulting and annoying unoffending wayfarers. On the present occasion a gang of these roughs were making

their way along the pavement in High Street, Islington, pushing all respectable persons whom they met into the roadway. A constable attempted to disperse them, but they collected in front of the Angel Hotel, formed a ring, and continued to annoy the foot passengers. One passer-by attempted to pass through the circle, but his hat was taken from his head, passed from hand to hand, and finally dropped in the roadway by a young woman, and on his attempting to pick it up he was struck in the face, and otherwise ill-treated, his hat being confiscated as a plaything by the mob. A fine of forty shillings or a month's imprisonment was the punishment inflicted upon these playful young men. Considering their social status, the cost of their amusement is certainly large, but an enthusiast for the sport in a good season need seldom deny himself the pleasure of participating in it.

There is another form of prevalent ruffianism with which it is more difficult to deal. The police reports have recently been full of gross cases of wife-beating, and only the other day a man was charged at the Southwark police-court with beating his spouse within an inch of her life. Crimes of violence, especially when women or children are the victims, always arouse popular indignation, and the comparative leniency of the sentences usually passed on the offenders is rightly regarded with disapprobation by the public. As a matter of fact, however, few forms of outrage are more difficult to deal with than this, for in nine cases out of ten the punishment really falls far more hardly upon the wife and children than upon the wife-beater himself. It is a very common criminal experience to find that a man who is ordinarily a "good provider," as Artemus Ward would call him, and a fairly kind husband, will occasionally give way to drink, and when in that condition, treat his wife with the greatest cruelty. Now, although drunkenness is no excuse for crime, it is obvious that in such a case a long term of imprisonment will deprive the house of its bread-winner, and entail great hardship and distress upon innocent people. Under such circumstances our magistrates usually exercise a wise discretion, and pass a sentence that is rather admonitory than penal.

In ordinary cases of felony heavy sentences and the certainty of detection do act as efficient deterrents; for the burglar, the thief, or the assassin have not the excuse that their immediate surroundings forced them into the crime. Poverty and squalor do not by any means conduce to dishonesty, but they must and do try the temper to an incalculable extent; and it is to violence of temper that wife-beating is in most cases to be traced. Drink is another very active cause; but here again legal punishment is very insufficient to effect a cure. The habitual drunkard is not often reformed by incarceration in prison; on the contrary, it is only too probable that he will, when the time comes, celebrate his release by getting drunk, and then "wallop his missus" as the cause of his late discomfort. While, therefore, the drunkard wife-beater is recruiting his health under the wholesome restraint of a prison, his wife is probably not only starving, but living in daily dread of the inevitable return of her ne'er-do-well and of a renewal of his ill-treatment. No wonder that poor women should be so eager to screen their husbands who have assaulted them, for the chances are that they will in the long run suffer less by so doing. The utterly incorrigible miscreant who ill-treats his wife habitually, and without any extenuating circumstances, is a different class of offender, and requires different treatment. On him the utmost rigours of the law might justly be brought to bear, and not a word could be said in his favour or in mitigation of his sentence. For any other class of wife-beater imprisonment, however necessary, only makes matters worse. It may be hoped that the numerous movements which are now taking place for the promotion of temperance, for improving workmen's dwellings, and for educating the masses to something like an appreciation of the first principles of economic and sanitary laws, may in time result in the amelioration of the condition of the poor, and so diminish this class of crime, as well as others. When poor people find that life is worth living, and that there are other pleasures besides the excitement of drink within their reach, they will not be slow to avail themselves of them, and we may fairly assume that wives who have learnt such lessons will not neglect their homes nor the husbands beat their wives. For the ordinary street rowdy, however, who makes the pathway unsafe for passers-by, and who assaults quiet and respectable people for the mere "fun of the thing," more drastic measures are required; and, if the law does not permit magistrates to pass adequate sentences in flagrant cases of this kind, it is time that the Legislature interfered to place more power in their hands. Unless something is done, the "rough" will soon dominate all our principal thoroughfares, and honest people will have to confine their peregrinations to the still unconquered districts.

THE RISE IN THE BANK RATE.

THE increase in the rates of interest charged for the use of capital in the short-loan market, not of London only, but all over Europe, is the most striking feature of the commercial situation at the present moment. On the Stock Exchange prices fluctuate with every movement in those rates, and though trade proper is not affected so much as the market for securities—partly because trade is now conducted so largely upon a cash basis, and partly because the rate of interest in the country generally is not governed exclusively by the rate charged in Lombard Street—still

even legitimate trade is affected, while speculative trade very largely feels the influence. Since August 18, a period of barely two months, the Bank rate of discount has been raised by three successive steps from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 per cent., a rise of exactly 100 per cent. In Paris, the rate having been raised on August 25 from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent., has remained at the latter level; and in Berlin the rate has been raised to $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for discount, and to 6 per cent. for loans, while in Amsterdam it was raised last week to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and this week to 4, and in Brussels it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The extraordinary enhancement in the value of money, to use the very inaccurate bankers' phrase which usage has rendered unavoidable, is due mainly to the diminution that has occurred in the cash reserves of the leading banks of Europe. The bullion held by the Bank of England is now only 21,700,000*l.*, against 27,400,000*l.* at this time last year, and 34,100,000*l.* at this time two years ago. There is thus a decrease of 5,700,000*l.* since last year, and a decrease of 12,400,000*l.* since 1879. The gold in the Bank of France, again, is only 24,300,000*l.*, against 27,400,000*l.* at the corresponding date last year; and the cash in the Bank of Germany is now only 25,760,000*l.*, against 26,800,000*l.* at this time last year. Thus the gold in the Bank of France has decreased 3,100,000*l.*, and the cash in the Bank of Germany has diminished 1,000,000*l.* The Bank of Germany does not discriminate between the gold and silver held by it, as does the Bank of France. We are unable, therefore, to say how much of the coin and bullion held by it is in the one metal or the other. But the general impression is that by far the larger portion is in silver. However this may be, we see that the gold reserves of the Banks of England and France have decreased in the last twelve months as much as 8,800,000*l.*, while the cash reserve of the Bank of Germany has decreased over another million. Reckoning the gold alone—and we presume that it is the gold alone which has diminished in the Bank of Germany—there is thus a diminution of very nearly 10 millions sterling in the cash reserves of the three leading banks of Europe, or about 12 per cent. This great diminution, without any means of rapid replenishment, has compelled the banks to take measures to protect their reserves. And the diminution itself has been brought about by the resumption of specie payments in the raw-material-producing countries.

Quite recently the great majority of commercial countries were under the *régime* of inconvertible paper money; but, one after the other, they have either resumed specie payments or they are preparing to do so. France led the way; then the United States followed three years ago. Now Italy has floated a loan for the purpose of enabling it to do likewise, and the Argentine Confederation is engaged in legislation looking to the same object; while it seems as if Austria-Hungary also would very soon undertake the task. Previously to New Year's Day, 1879, when the United States resumed specie payments, the Government of that country had accumulated a large stock of gold—had, in fact, intercepted and locked up the whole of the produce of the American mines for two or three years. Since then the great prosperity enjoyed by the United States and the exceedingly bad harvests with which Europe has been visited have enabled the American people to go on taking more and more gold. Besides retaining at home the whole of the produce of their own mines they have imported from Europe about 40 millions sterling in gold, the result being, as we have just seen, a great depletion of the leading banks in Europe. The Americans have been enabled to do this primarily by the fact that their harvests have been exceedingly good, while the European harvests have been exceedingly bad; and, consequently, Europe owed to America a large debt, which the latter insisted should be partly paid in gold. But another circumstance contributed to the result. The three great reserves of gold in Europe are held by the Banks of England, France, and Germany. Some years ago the Bank of France held much the largest quantity; but it has gradually been losing its stock, until now it has very little more than the Bank of England. It is to be borne in mind that the Bank of France has a branch in every department of France, and that some of the branches, such as those in great towns like Lyons, Marseilles, Rouen, and Bordeaux, do a very large and important business, and require, therefore, large reserves in coin and bullion; that is to say, the Bank of France requires for its ordinary purposes a larger amount of till-money than does the Bank of England, and consequently is obliged to keep a much larger stock of metal than the latter institution. But, on the other hand, both silver and gold being legal tender in France, the Bank, for its internal purposes, is able to use silver as well as gold. It is only for external payments that gold is absolutely requisite. As we have said, however, the stock of gold in the Bank of France has been allowed to run down, until it now little exceeds the stock held by the Bank of England. Moreover, of the stock held by the Bank of France much the larger part is in light coin—that is to say, is not full legal tender, and therefore is scarcely available for foreign payments. When the great demand for gold arose in the United States, the wise course for the Bank of France would have been to raise its rate of discount, and thus to check the drain to the United States. But it chose to do otherwise, and consequently the drain went on, with the result that we have just been pointing out. The Bank of France is a State bank under Government control; and the Government of the Republic, being anxious to win the support of the capitalist classes by proving to them that trade can be as good and money as cheap under the Republic as under the Empire, insisted that the Bank should not raise its rate of discount. In return it ordered the Receivers-General to collect all the gold they could in getting in the taxes, and

to pay the whole into the Bank of France. Still, as the figures we have quoted show, the drain was so great that the depletion of the cash reserve went on. Thus the ultimate result of the action of the Government was to drain the circulation of gold as well as the reserve of the Bank. At last the Bank has become alarmed. Even now it has not raised its rate of discount above 4 per cent.; that is to say, it keeps the rate fully 1 per cent. lower than the Bank of England. But it refuses to pay gold on application—those who wish to cash notes being obliged to accept silver, or, if they obtain any gold, it is in very light and small pieces. The refusal of the Bank of France to pay gold has thrown the whole drain upon England and Germany. The Bank of Germany has raised its rate to $\frac{5}{2}$ per cent.; besides, as we have already said, it is generally believed that the Bank holds but very little gold. Consequently the main pressure at present falls upon the Bank of England; and the Bank, to protect itself, has been obliged, in the course of two months, to double the rate it charges to its customers for the accommodation it affords.

The demand for gold is chiefly for the United States, but it is not exclusively so. Italy also, as we have already said, is preparing to resume specie payments. Some months ago it floated a loan for that purpose, the contractors engaging to furnish it with 8 millions sterling in gold. And they have been gradually fulfilling their contract. A part of the sum they obtained from the Bank of England, and a part they have picked up in provincial France, in Germany, in Holland, in Russia, and even in Egypt. Their object has been to spare the London money market as much as possible, and immediately, no doubt, they have spared it. But in the long run it comes very much to the same thing whether the gold is taken directly from London or from the sources from which London supplies itself when needful. The contractors for the Italian loan have been gathering up assiduously all the spare gold that existed anywhere in Europe, and consequently, when the Bank of England raises its rate of discount both in order to prevent the withdrawal of gold and also to attract gold from elsewhere, it is found that the supplies are so scanty that the rise of the rate does not act as effectually as was expected. Another curious result of the action of the Italian loan contractors is that the demand which at this time of the year springs up in various quarters—as, for example, in Egypt—for English gold has been accentuated. For the contractors had already taken away any spare gold that existed in those quarters; and therefore, as soon as the demand arose, it had to address itself to London directly. The Argentine Confederation also has been taking a considerable amount of gold. The Confederation, like most of the raw-material-producing countries, suffered severely in the late depression; but prosperity has now returned, and with prosperity the value of its paper has been rapidly rising, until it is now very nearly up to par; and preparations are being made for the resumption of specie payments. Accordingly, a demand for gold has sprung up; and, though it is neither so large nor so pressing as the demand from the United States or from Italy, it is still, when added to both these drains, sufficient to make itself felt upon the London market. In addition to all these demands, there are temporary and small demands for various quarters, such as Egypt, Vienna, Constantinople, India, and other places. In themselves each of these demands is small, but, when added together and combined with the drain to the United States, Italy, and the River Plate, they aggravate the pressure upon the London market, and compel the enhancement in the value of money which we have seen.

As regards the future, it seems clear that the interest paid for the use of capital in the short-loan market must be higher than it has been of late. The present urgent demands will no doubt soon subside. That for the United States will certainly pass away at the end of the year, if not sooner. The Italian demand, also, is of definite amount, and will in the course of next year be satisfied; while the other demands are in themselves either temporary or unimportant. But nevertheless the value of money must rule higher than it has done for some years back, partly because the cash reserves of all the leading banks are so very low, and partly because trade is improving. It is one of the inevitable consequences of an improvement in trade that both prices and wages rise. It is the great rise both in prices and wages which is the cause of the demand for gold in the United States. When prosperity set in in 1878, after the long depression that followed the New York panic of 1873, the inflation of the currency was necessary to enable the new business to be done. And, to a lesser extent, the same inflation, must follow wherever there is increased prosperity. The rise of wages not only implies that the same number of workpeople are paid larger sums, but that additional workpeople are taken on. It implies, in fact, that the whole of the labouring classes are fully employed, and that each employer, in order to attract the best labour to himself, is competing with his neighbours by offering better wages. It implies also that capital is employed to its fullest extent, that every kind of business is being extended, and that enterprise and speculation are active. This being so, it necessarily follows that the demand for money is active, and consequently that the prices to be paid for it must be higher than when that demand is light. It seems probable, therefore, that the period of very cheap money, which has now lasted so long, has drawn to a close, and that for some time to come we may see higher rates steadily ruling.

THE CESAREWITCH.

EVEN if the Cesarewitch had not been run, the handicap would have been interesting as an official statement of the relative merits of many well-known horses, as far as they could be judged on public form at the time the weights were arranged. There are so many races in these days that it is difficult to remember their various conditions; so, before considering the details of the late Cesarewitch, it may be as well to notice the terms under which that race is run. The Cesarewitch is a handicap run during the Second October Meeting at Newmarket, when every racehorse in training has presumably shown his form in public during the season. It is natural to expect the great autumn handicaps to be far more accurate than the City and Suburban, the Great Metropolitan Stakes, and the other spring handicaps; for, generally speaking, many of the starters for the latter races have not run in public since the previous autumn, and great changes often take place in racehorses during their winter's holiday. Some thicken and lay on muscle; others fall away or grow weedy; while others become so gross that it is impossible to get them thoroughly fit until some time after the great spring handicaps are over. In the autumn, however, there is no excuse for horses being insufficiently trained, and they are then more likely to be overworked and drawn too fine than to be too fleshy and under-trained. It is sometimes the case that a horse is kept more or less in reserve for the autumn handicaps, and either not run at all during the previous part of the season, or merely run when half prepared. Occasionally horses are absolutely pulled in their earlier races in order to ensure their being lightly weighted for one or other of the October handicaps; but running them half-trained is an expedient more frequently resorted to by those who race for profit rather than for honour. Nevertheless, in by far the greater number of cases, the competitors for the great autumn handicaps have been run with the intention of winning several times during the season. The length of the Cesarewitch course is about two miles and a quarter, and as at least one or two horses are usually started solely to make the running in the earlier parts of the race, the pace is generally very fast, and consequently the Cesarewitch is a severe trial of stamina. A course that is half as long again as that of the Derby is obviously a wearying one, especially when the race is run at a high speed from start to finish. The Ascot Stakes, which is run over a course two miles long, and the Goodwood Stakes, a race two and a half miles in length, are the two long races of most importance next to the Cesarewitch, and they form to a great extent the guides to the handicappers, as well as to the gamblers, who deal with the Cesarewitch. The entrance is 25*l.* each, 15*l.* forfeit, and 3*l.* only for those who do not accept on the publication of the handicap; and, in consequence of these easy terms for non-acceptors, a large number of horses are generally entered. The Jockey Club adds 300*l.*; but, considering what an important race the Cesarewitch is, the stake is not a large one, as it seldom exceeds 1,600*l.*; while the Manchester Cup, which is a handicap with somewhat similar entrance fees, was this year worth 2,500*l.* The great profit often made on a Cesarewitch victory proceeds mainly from betting. The weights apportioned to the horses entered for the Cesarewitch are subject to certain subsequent alterations. If a horse wins the St. Leger, he has to carry at least 8 st. 5 lbs. In the present year, this condition made no difference in Iroquois's weight, as he had been handicapped on those very terms. Last year, Robert the Devil had been handicapped at 8 st. 6 lbs., so his weight also remained unaltered by his victory in the St. Leger; but if Ishmael, who started second favourite for the late St. Leger, had won that race, his weight for the Cesarewitch would thereby have been raised almost a stone. A winner of a handicap worth more than 300*l.*, after the date of the publication of the Cesarewitch weights (September 1st), has to carry 10 lbs. extra, and a winner of any handicap of less value, 5 lbs. extra. For winning weight-for-age races after the publication of the weights there are no penalties, with the single exception of the fixed weight for the winner of the St. Leger. Some ten days before the late Cesarewitch two horses won weight-for-age races worth more than double the amount which would have added 10 lbs. to their weights if they had been running for handicaps, and yet their Cesarewitch weights remained unaltered. This condition, though not peculiar to the Cesarewitch, is by no means the universal rule in handicaps. Very often the terms are that the winners of any race after a certain date are to carry "5 lbs. extra; of two races, or one value 500 sovs., 10 lbs. extra." The 200*l.* given to the second and the 100*l.* given to the third horse in the Cesarewitch generally lead to several horses being ridden out to the very last.

Robert the Devil had won the Cesarewitch last year. He was now handicapped at 9 st. 10 lbs.—a weight which exceeded by more than a stone any that had ever been carried to victory in that race before. But last season Robert the Devil had won in a canter by four lengths under the highest weight ever carried by a Cesarewitch winner of any age, so his supporters thought there was good reason for hoping that he might win under a still heavier burden; they therefore backed him heavily until his withdrawal from the race showed them that it is well to be cautious before plunging on a heavily-weighted candidate for the Cesarewitch. At the other end of the handicap, weighted at 6 st. 2 lbs., was an unnamed three-year-old filly by Galopin out of Corrie. This filly had run three times last year without winning, but she had not run in public this season. It was rumoured that she was very

fast, and that she could stay, and private reputations seem to be more esteemed than public performances among gamblers on the Cesarewitch and the Cambridgeshire. At any rate, the Corrie filly became a good favourite, although she afterwards fluctuated in the betting market like the shares of a bubble company in a panic. A few days before the race, she slipped and fell heavily, but without doing herself any apparent damage. Up to the very day of the Cesarewitch she was backed for large sums of money, but three hours before the race, to the chagrin of her supporters, she was scratched. Reveller, who had only run once this season, and then indifferently, was supposed to have been reserved to win the Cesarewitch. He was a five-year-old, weighted at 8 st. 1 lb. Last year he had won the Visitors' Plate at Ascot, the Goodwood Stakes, and the Great Yorkshire Handicap, but he had been beaten five times. Goodwood Stakes' winners are the kind of horses for the Cesarewitch, and Reveller was only to carry 11 lbs. more than the weight he won under at Goodwood nearly fifteen months ago. Retreat was a four-year-old colt by Hermit, handicapped at 7 st. 9 lbs. Last year he had run five times unsuccessfully, but this season he had won the Royal Stakes at Epsom, and at the same meeting, when receiving 12 lbs. from Petronel, he had run within three-quarters of a length of him. In the Cesarewitch he was handicapped 25 lbs. below Petronel. His best performance, however, had been in the Ascot Stakes, for which he had come in first, under 8 st., but he had been disqualified on the ground of his having cannoned and bored against Teviotdale, who came in second.

When Iroquois had won the St. Leger he was at once backed at a short price for the Cesarewitch, but Geologist, who had been second in the St. Leger, soon became an even better favourite, and his name stood for some time at the head of the betting quotations in the newspapers. He was to meet Iroquois at an advantage of 12 lbs. in the Cesarewitch, and it was generally believed that Iroquois had not given him a 12 lbs. beating in the St. Leger. The public backed him for large sums of money, and then he was scratched. In course of time Iroquois also was scratched, but, as Mistake was in the same stable, the betting public thought that the reason of Iroquois's withdrawal must be that his trainer knew Mistake to be the better of the pair at their respective Cesarewitch weights. Mistake was a four-year-old colt weighted at 7 st. 9 lbs. His career this season had not hitherto been very glorious, as he had only won a single race out of seven for which he had started.

During the First October Meeting at Newmarket there was a grand revolution among the favourites for the Cesarewitch. In a Triennial Stakes, Cameliard, after being a strong favourite, was beaten by Fiddler. Now Fiddler was handicapped for the Cesarewitch at the low weight of 6 st. 10 lbs., so he was at once installed as first favourite for that race. His reign, however, was but a short one, for the next day Foxhall, the winner of the Grand Prix de Paris, won the Grand Duke Michael Stakes by four lengths, giving 7 lbs. to each of his opponents, among whom was Ishmael, whose performances we have often described. There was then a general rush to back Foxhall, who was at once enthroned as first favourite, a post which he occupied up to the time of the start. He was handicapped at 7 st. 12 lbs., or 7 lbs. below Iroquois, and it was maintained by his admirers that his running with Ishmael in the Grand Duke Michael Stakes proved him to be as good a horse as Iroquois, if not a better. It was thought by many people that a former Cesarewitch winner had a very fair chance of repeating his victory. This was Chippendale, the winner of 1879, who was to carry 8 st. 12 lbs. At this weight he was handicapped, at weight for age, almost on a par with Foxhall. We have noticed on several occasions the public performances of Petronel. It seemed probable that he was the best horse saddled for the race, but 9 st. 6 lbs. is such a crushing weight in a handicap like the Cesarewitch that his winning appeared almost beyond the bounds of probability. Ambassadors had long been expected to win a good race, and as a four-year-old she was very leniently treated at 6 st. 11 lbs. Another lightly-weighted four-year-old was The Star, who had only won one out of twenty-one races, and when he did win, he had started at 20 to 1.

Nineteen horses went to the starting-post, and they were sent away without any delay worth noticing. There had not been so small a field for the Cesarewitch for thirteen years, but it is better to have a moderate number of starters than that the race should be delayed by an extra horse or two of troublesome dispositions. The pace was what racing-men call "a cracker" from the start, and the time occupied by the race was eighteen seconds less than that of last year. The running during the early part of the race was made by two 40 to 1 outsiders, called Americanus and Sirdar. When they had gone about a mile, Fiddler, the fifth favourite, took up the running, and kept it up to the Bushes and down the hill. In the Dip, Foxhall and Retreat dashed up to Fiddler, while Chippendale raced after them. Fiddler then gave way, and Foxhall took the lead, followed by Retreat. It was now certain that Foxhall had beaten Retreat; but, when Chippendale came up, Foxhall was pressed forward again by his jockey. Chippendale made a gallant effort to run up to the American, but to no purpose, as Foxhall galloped in, a ridiculously easy winner, twelve lengths in advance of him. The rider of Retreat eased his horse when his stable-companion Chippendale had passed him, and allowed Fiddler to be third. There can be no question that Foxhall's easy victory was a very grand performance. Whether it was better than Robert the Devil's victory under a heavier

weight by 8 lbs. is another matter. Foxhall is essentially an American-bred horse, for not only was he foaled in America, but both his sire and his dam and his two grand-dams were, if we mistake not, bred in that country. Of course, like racehorses all over the world, he is descended from English stock, and his grandsire on his father's side was the famous King Tom. If a Foxhall and an Iroquois come over every year, we shall have to begin to think seriously about improving our breed of horses. We may conclude by observing that Foxhall was trained by William Day, whose well-written book on *The Racehorse in Training* we had the pleasure of praising in these columns some time ago.

REVIEWS.

THE IMPERIAL GAZETTEER OF INDIA.*

THE writer of an excellent article on Sir R. Temple's "India" in the July number of the *Quarterly* mentions incidentally that he had just received "the first six volumes of Dr. Hunter's great work, on which he had been engaged for the last six years." Mr. W. W. Hunter, of the Bengal Civil Service, has, we beg leave to remind the editor of the *Quarterly*, done much more than turn out just half a volume a year. The plain fact is that the Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India, for this is his correct official designation, has compiled, between 1869 and 1880, just one hundred volumes relating to the history, revenue, population, agriculture, commerce, and a great deal besides, of twelve provinces and two hundred and ten districts. Of these no less than ninety volumes have been in print and circulation for some time past. The latest production of Mr. Hunter's pen is something rather different. In the earlier work, about one volume on an average was devoted to a couple of districts, and these productions will be of sterling value to those district officials who are constantly changed and who yet are really the very bones and sinews of the Anglo-Indian frame. When a Magistrate or Deputy-Commissioner is suddenly shifted from one station to another, from Chittagong on the shores of the Bay of Bengal, to Bankura in the West; from Gujranwala on the Chenab, to the Derajat across the Indus, he will find in some one volume or other of the statistical work everything that the toil and research of his predecessors have put on record. But it is obvious that the general student, the M.P., or the Governor fresh from England, requires something more portable, compendious, and concise. And this want the nine volumes of the *Gazetteer* are calculated to supply. The earlier volumes, as remarked in the preface, "although by no means too elaborate for administrative requirements, are practically within the reach of but a small official class." The plan of a grand work of this kind is not a new idea. It was one of the *minæ ingentes* and the *opera imperfecta* of the old Court of Directors. It formed the subject of correspondence more than a century ago. It is associated with the names of Francis Buchanan and Montgomery Martin. Of isolated attempts to supply information about castes and trades, summary Revenue Settlements and intricate rent-free tenures, rivers and sand banks, ancient monuments and new marts and bazaars, there has been no lack. Some of these have been printed, circulated, and eaten by moths and worms. Others lie buried in manuscript under the masses of correspondence which Leadenhall Street accumulated and made over to the India Office at Westminster. Many were distinguished by fulness of knowledge, scrupulous accuracy of detail, and politic breadth of view. But it was all unconnected and disjointed. Nothing had been done on a comprehensive, uniform, systematic plan; and while in one or two departments much had been recorded twice over, in others a vast fund of information passed away and perished with the recollections and talk of some antiquated Collector or Commissioner, who had been the successful ruler of a province, or, in Oriental phraseology, the father of the people. Moreover, in many instances the labour had been unpaid. It became imperative that the task of devising a correct plan, of disciplining a staff of workers, of procuring a sufficiency of material, and of digesting and arranging it under the most convenient heads, should be entrusted to one single individual. It was still further desirable that he should be a member of the Civil Service, and that he should be possessed of considerable literary ability. Familiarity with Indian phraseology, with the outlines of our legal and financial system, and with the main divisions of the civil and military and subordinate agency, was one essential; and the power of shaping rude masses of information, and of bestowing on them as much literary grace and polish as the subjects admitted, was another.

That these qualifications are admirably united in Mr. Hunter it needs no labour to demonstrate. There is happily in the vast field of Anglo-Indian administration room for the exercise of every exceptional and peculiar gift—enunciation of liberal principles in a comprehensive minute or despatch, proficiency in Oriental classics, skill in reproducing the discoveries of others, tact and judgment in the management of the Englishman and the treatment of the native. The present is an example of the union of official knowledge with descriptive power. A large portion of the nine volumes before us may be found in some

* *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*. By W. W. Hunter, C.I.E., LL.D., Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India. 9 vols. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

shape or other in the hundred volumes of the Statistical accounts. But one chief merit of the present work is its reduction in bulk and its alphabetical sequence. It is a Gazetteer from A to Z, telling us much of every native State in India, independent, feudatory, and completely dependent; of every province and of every district in the British territories; of every ancient place of renown or importance; and of every modern city, bazaar, mart, emporium, or village which either its trade, its geographical position, or its population has lifted above the low level of mere local celebrity. Where there were six or seven hundred villages in each police circle, and four or five hundred souls to each square mile, it was absolutely necessary to make some selection. It is quite possible that an inquiring administrator may hunt in vain for a populous town or big straggling village which he once cleared of Dacoits, or where, when in camp, he administered prompt and salutary chastisement to a band of *budmashes* and *Lattials*; but, as a general rule, the selection of places has been judicious. About eight thousand, we are informed in the preface, were thought to merit notice. But it would be erroneous to conclude that the *Gazetteer* only supplies the inquirer with what he wants to know about districts, capitals, head-stations, subdivisions, and market towns. There are correct lists of castes, and a short essay on their peculiarities. Wild tribes—Gonds, Santals, Bhils, and Koles—are all passed in review. There are excellent notices of rivers, mines, and manufactures; to every province or city is prefixed an historical narrative of moderate compass, showing how the Hindu Raja succumbed to the Mussulman King and conqueror, and how again the Nawab or Viceroy claimed independence of his own imperial Agra or Delhi, was the founder of a new dynasty, coined his own money, and beautified his own capital. The faint traces left by Greek civilization in Upper India are commemorated; a Hindu might dwell with satisfaction on the enumeration of spots hallowed by the presence of one hundred thousand pilgrims, from Umballa in the north to Sangoor Island or Rameswaram on the shores of the Southern Ocean; the possessions still held by the French and the Portuguese, and the traces left by Dutchmen and Danes, are succinctly placed before us; and, if intending colonists or settlers would do well to pause before they put their trust in reports about seams of coal or auriferous deposits in mountain ranges, the sportsman and naturalist will be at no loss to know where he is to look for bison and sambhur, and in what cultivated districts he must content himself with wild-fowl and snipe in the cold season, or with hares, partridges, and quail, and perhaps a stray bustard or a "ravine deer."

No one knows better than the author that some of his materials must be of a perishable or changeable nature. *Multa pars vitabit Libitinam*. The ancient histories, the gradations of caste, the commercial and industrial importance of most marts and cities will remain pretty much as they are for years, though the creation of a new line of railway or a navigable canal may possibly affect the wealth and prosperity of some towns and bazaars now the centres of commercial activity. Cities, it is true, may decline, as Agra has done, or be overrun with jungle like Dacca, while obscure spots may hereafter rise into prominence, like Jamalpore on the East Indian Railway, which is almost a counterpart of Wolverton on the London and North-Western line. Population will of course fluctuate. Where the demands of the Government have not been fixed in perpetuity, the statistics of the revenue will also alter for the better in another generation. Possibly the rainfall may be slightly affected, as it certainly has been for worse where rich landholders in the Western parts of Lower Bengal have cut down large forests of Sal timber without turning the cleared spaces into arable land. Irrigation may improve the condition of the agriculturist and prevent or mitigate famine. With the spread of civilization new wants will be felt; and subdivisions, police-stations, Small-Cause Courts as they are termed in India, besides mission stations, chapels and churches, will be established in places of which Mr. Hunter's coadjutors never dreamt. Of course a new census may materially upset all the calculations derived from the last census of 1870, on which reliance has been placed. But even here past labours will become guides and landmarks. A new Director-General thirty years hence will know exactly where to remodel and re-edit, but we are bound to say that it would be very difficult to improve the design, and dangerous to alter the proportions or to vary the arrangement which the Director-General laid down for the observance of his coadjutors and subordinates. We are sorry to see that Mr. Hunter, possibly as a sort of concession to the Liberal cant and twaddle which passes in these days for enlightenment and philanthropy, has made one very pointless remark. He tells us that he has ever "borne in mind that the work has been paid for by the Indian people, and that it was primarily designed as an aid to the better government of this country." We are quite aware that the salary of Mr. Hunter while engaged on this important business is paid not from the English Treasury, but out of the revenue paid by Ryots and Zemindars, or from the arrack and opium which they consume, or the license-tax which they evade, just as the salary of Lord Ripon or Lord Hartington, or the remuneration of Gomez the copyist in the Home Office at Calcutta, or that of De Mello, Head Clerk to the Commissioner of "the Jungle Mehals," is paid. But we apprehend that each of these necessary and useful personages discharges his proper functions on the principle of trying to do good work for his pay. And we are tempted to ask whether Mr. Hunter's salary could not be charged on the taxation paid solely by the European community to the general Treasury, without

reference to that contributed by the "Indian people." It is a fact that to customs, excise, income-tax or license-tax, as well as to municipal funds, the Anglo-Indian community makes large and punctual contributions. It also would lead us too far away into a financial controversy to speculate, on the other hand, on the very considerable amount of rent-free lands set apart, under endless denominations, for the maintenance of Hindu and Mohammedan "ecclesiastical establishments." And the change from Asiatic tyranny, waste, profusion, caprice, and injustice, to British equity, method, economy, scrupulous regard for the rights of individuals and communities, law and justice, is one which, though hardly to be estimated in gold and silver, may well be "paid for," like Mr. Hunter's own salary, by "the Indian people." It is a more agreeable task to notice the appreciation by Mr. Hunter of the labour of his subordinates both in India and in England. If this work was ever to be done at all, it needed all the devotion of civilians and military men duly selected and adequately paid. And we have no doubt that the whole expenditure is as fully justified by its objects and results as an outlay on a new court house, a model prison, an irrigation canal, or a detailed record of the rights in the soil of half a million of cultivators.

The order followed in the description of any one district is something as follows. First we have its physical and natural features. Perhaps it is a level plain, long converted from grass and jungle into one sheet of varying cultivation; or it is cut up by ravines and diversified by low ranges of hills still clothed with forest and underwood; or it is a vast alluvial formation gradually raised and fertilized by the silt brought down by a score of rivers; or it is an undulating plateau, with a pleasant climate, some fifteen hundred or two thousand feet above sea level. Next we have the history, if the tract has anything that can be so called, and we learn how some Hindu Raja built a fort or founded a bazaar, and how some Mohammedan general captured the stronghold and slew or spared the Raja on payment of tribute. Then come statistics of population, castes, agriculture, the tenures of land, the trades, manufactures, and commerce; the calamities by which the district has been impoverished, whether raids, drought, or inundation; the machinery of administration and the medical and the sanitary aspects. Some cities, owing to their traditions, history, sanctity, and political importance, we look for and are sure to find. When we descend to local marts and rustic villages, we make out that the criterion of insertion is a population of at least one thousand souls. But, as we have said, one merit of the *Gazetteer* is not merely its correct description of big towns and districts, and its enumeration of villages on the banks of rivers on which ply fleets of boats laden with sugar, indigo, or jute. A large space is devoted to Provinces—Bengal, Bombay, and Madras; and one of the volumes is more than half filled with an article on "India." This is exactly a subject to test the judgment and capacity of a compiler. Little places are easily dealt with on one plan. Something ending in *pur*, *abad*, or *nagar* is in such and such latitude; it has a weekly market, a school, a municipality, a big reservoir, and a ruined shrine, and this is all that can be known about it; and so with some thousand others. But in an article on India, from sheer plethora of material, it is difficult to fix where you are to begin, or, having begun, where to stop. Mr. Hunter has endeavoured to tell us something interesting about our grand dependency in 535 pages, making up the larger part of Vol. IV. The history of India, properly so termed, is here judiciously condensed. Mythical Hindus; early Arab conquests; Mohammedan Emperors at Agra and Sultans in the Deccan; the growth of the Mahratta power; the settlers from Europe—Portuguese, Dutch, French, and ourselves; the Company's commercial agents gradually developing into captains of armies and rulers of men—all this is concisely told. Here and there a pithy remark or an apt conclusion is a set-off to a long string of dates and names. But useful information is given about the religions, trades, arts, manufactures, and habits of the people; and a perusal might give those self-sufficient gentlemen who are so ready offhand to "give up India" some little insight into the reasons why, under Providence, we find ourselves there and the pledges we lie under a moral obligation to fulfil. It is the fashion to call ourselves the inheritors of the Mogul supremacy, and to look on the Queen as the representative of Akbar and Shah Jehan. Mr. Hunter says pointedly that we won India or the larger part of it, not from the effete successors of Akbar, but from Hindus. Our most determined enemies were Mahratta confederates. Our ablest opponent was a Mussulman soldier of fortune who had dethroned a Hindu Raja in the far South. One of our most important provinces was wrested in two campaigns from the Sikhs. But we must break off here and reserve for a future occasion a more detailed notice of specific accounts of parts of this magnificent heritage.

GALLAND'S JOURNAL AT CONSTANTINOPLE.*

THESE two beautifully printed volumes are worthy of better contents. Antoine Galland is deservedly famous as the first European translator of the *Arabian Nights*. His version is not a good one, but it has served as the basis of all the common popular editions that have succeeded it; and, as the source of

* *Journal d'Antoine Galland pendant son séjour à Constantinople (1692-1693)*. Publié et annoté par Charles Schefer, Aumbré de l'Institut. 2 vols. Paris: Leroux. 1881.

Infinite pleasure to innumerable people of all ages and many nations, it must be reckoned among the good gifts of the world. But the interest of Galland's translation of the *Arabian Nights* arises from its subject and its priority, not from its author or its style. Galland does not seem to have been a particularly interesting personage. He had the merit of rising from obscure parentage to a position in the learned world, and he travelled several times in the Levant, besides living for three years at Constantinople in the French Embassy; but he appears to have been always a plodding student without very remarkable natural gifts, and his writings produce an impression of honest labour rather than of intuitive talent. His Journal, therefore, cannot be prized on account of the light it throws on the life and character of the writer. As a matter of fact it throws scarcely any; but, if it did, it would perhaps reveal little that we should care to see.

It is on external grounds—on the information it gives as to the affairs of the time—that Galland's Journal must be valued. Any account of the Ottoman capital in the seventeenth century would possess a certain interest. There are many matters connected with modern Turkey on which the testimony of an eye-witness two centuries ago might throw a peculiar light, and it is often important to ascertain the antiquity and permanence of a custom or law. It is true that De la Croix has illustrated this very period in his *Memoirs*; but there is room for much additional information, and any authentic documents of the time must prove useful to special historians. M. Schefer, the editor of these volumes, attaches some considerable importance to the political aspect of the Journal. Galland was attached to M. de Nointel's embassy at Constantinople at a time when the relations of Louis XIV. with the Porte were dangerously strained; and undoubtedly, in the absence of better evidence, this Journal would possess a high value to the investigator of the history of the foreign policy of France in the seventeenth century. M. de Nointel appears to have been scarcely the man to heal the breach. From his arrival in 1670 to his recall five years later he made himself offensive to the Porte and troublesome to his own Government. His peculiar methods of paying the expenses of his tour in the Levant were the proximate cause of his final catastrophe, and he returned to Paris completely broken down. As Dangeau said of him, "Il avait été ambassadeur à Constantinople. Il y alla ruiné, et en revint encore plus gueux." The history of French negotiations at the Porte under such a man might be somewhat exciting, and another man might have brought out the political situation effectively; but we confess that the details recorded in these volumes appear to us both tame and meagre, and one has a strong impression throughout the reading of them that Galland did not care a rush about the delicate or indelicate negotiations of his Excellency, but preferred sauntering about among the booksellers' shops, in the hope of picking up a fine manuscript or perhaps a medallion, to all the diplomacy in the world.

We were about to say that Galland takes an infinite interest in little things; the amount of snow and ice, and then of rain, which apparently prevailed during his stay at Constantinople, affords him an inexhaustible topic for his diary; the frost, he says, is so severe he can hardly write; the snow is a foot deep; the wind is detestable; or he saw three books for three piastres—one of them was entitled so and so, and his Excellency bought it; he shot an arrow perpendicularly into the air, and, to his surprise, it came down again perpendicularly upon him and ran into him; he picked up a chessboard for so much and made a sketch of it; he translated so many pages of an obscure Turkish book; or he stood awhile obtaining "un divertissement assez agréable" from the rapidity with which the Ottoman gardeners planted onions. But we unexpectedly found our criticism forestalled by M. Galland himself:—

If this Journal [he writes on February 16, 1672] should fall into other hands than mine, and trifling remarks of this kind should be noticed, I am content to inform whosoever it be, with respect to these and any other, that, as I write for nobody's satisfaction but my own, I put down no remark without very good reasons, either for my own instruction, or for other ends which cannot be known to all the world; and if they say that the price of a book, a change of wind, a hot day, a cold day, &c., are not things to put in a Journal, and the practice only serves to swell it with mere nothings—without otherwise justifying my proceeding, I have no objection to saying that I do it because I like to do it—*sum cuique pulchrum*. It is surely the least you can allow a man to satisfy himself and give him leave to use all the freedom he chooses in what he undertakes for his own benefit.

After this trenchant defence it is impossible to contest M. Galland's perfect right to inscribe whatever he pleases in his own diary; but it is also our perfect right to say that he pleases to choose uncommonly dull things to record. Now and then he is on the brink of being amusing. The junior member for Northampton will be glad to learn that the miseries of dwelling in a clock-tower have been experienced by distinguished persons before himself. The Mohammedan equivalent for a clock-tower is of course a minaret, and it seems that the Venetian Envoy was put to considerable personal annoyance by being lodged at the base of a minaret, whence the perhaps melodious, but unquestionably penetrating, voice of the muezzin too often resounded abroad and below. The story of the Jew who said that Turks would not be admitted into paradise, but would have to put up with tents outside and look after the Israelitish horses, and was answered by the Sultan, that as there would be no money in heaven, the Jews might as well prepay the cost of the tents, for which a tax was immediately imposed by his Majesty, is really excellent. And sometimes the

records of book purchases are interesting; one envies the discovery of a beautiful MS. of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, on vellum, of the fifteenth century, with marginal notes, for half a piastre; and it is amusing to study the agonies through which the learned world passed in trying to make out the writing of the Miraj Nameh in Uigur character, and the innocence of the budding Orientalist when he writes how he picked up "a big Persian book called the 'Shah Nameh,'" with one hundred and twenty miniatures, for thirty piastres. But what possible interest attaches to the following note:—

Son excellence avoit envoyé remercier le Baile de Venise des compliments qu'il luy avoit envoyé faire par son premier secrétaire sur la mort de M. son frère, par son premier Drogman, au défaut de son premier secrétaire qui estoit indisposé. Il fit faire la même chose à MM. les Résidens de Gennes et d'Hollande par le second Drogman.—P. 47, vol. ii.

The greater part of these volumes is made up of this sort of information, except where the notes bear the character rather of a meteorological forecast or a catalogue of a book sale; and, to confess the truth, we have seldom plodded through so dreary a work as this Journal of M. Galland's. There is very little to relieve the monotony of the wearisome repetitions of diplomatic civilities and incivilities, except now and then a grand procession, a feast of the Orthodox church, or a journey to Adrianople. Now and again, however, we light upon something more generally interesting than the number of guns in a Genoese salute or the unfriendly relations between the Patriarch and the Archbishop of Naxos. It is pleasant to read of the Sunday amusements of the Embassy—how they used to devote that day to dramatic representations, and played the *Cid*, and *L'Ecole des maris*, or *La femme juge et partie*, and how Galland was got up in a Greek lady's dress to take the part of Elvira in the *Cid*. The Ambassador's brother died, however, and thus put a stop to these frivolities. Another amusement of his Excellency was sending Turkish slaves on board French men-of-war in the livery of the Embassy, and thus procuring their liberty. M. de Nointel also affected a good deal of pomp in his public appearances. He would go to mass preceded by his servants in livery, his state chair borne by porters, and six janissaries, with the usual interpreters and dragomans; riding in the midst himself, with four grooms in Greek dress running by his side; and followed by his almoner, first secretary, household, and merchants, on foot; after which, a groom with a superb led horse, and the French inhabitants in large numbers. In fact, he had been ordered by the King to make an impression upon the Porte by the sumptuousness of his state. But the Turks were too well used to idle pageants to draw any decided inferences as to the power and wealth of France from her ambassador's display. They did these things better themselves. Galland is overwhelmed and dazzled by the magnificence of the Sultan's progress from Adrianople to open the Polish campaign:—

J'avois vu quelque échantillon de la magnificence de l'empire ottoman dans les marches du Grand Seigneur à la mosquée, aux jours du grand et du petit Bayram, à l'audience qui fut donnée à S.E., et dans l'entrée triomphale des galères après la prise de Candie; mais je n'avois rien vu qui approchât de la beauté de l'éclat et de l'appareil surprenant de la sortie hors d'Adrinople que Sa Hautesse fit en ce jour pour se mettre en campagne. Toutes les descriptions d'entrées, de triomphes, de tournois, de carrouzels, de mascarades, et de jeux faites à plaisir, que je me souviens d'avoir lues dans les romans, n'ont rien qui doive les faire entrer en comparaison avec la pompe de celle effective que je considérai exactement avec tous les étrangers chrétiens qui s'y trouverent, lesquels pourroient tous, pour ce que fut dans un état de désintéressement et sans préoccupation, faire témoignage de cette vérité. Si Mademoiselle de Scudéri avoit pu se forger dans l'imagination quelque chose de semblable, et qu'après l'y avoir représenté avec le crayon de son élégante plume, elle luy eût donné place dans quelque endroit de ses ouvrages, tous ceux qui y prennent plaisir à cause du vraisemblable qu'elle a toujours taché d'y observer, n'en feroient plus la même estime après avoir leu ce morceau, qui bien loin de leur paroître vraisemblable à l'ordinaire, leur paroistroit encore au-dessus des extravagances des paladins et de nos Amadis de Gaule. Cependant, il n'y a rien de si vray que ceste sortie estoit la plus belle chose que j'aye jamais vue en ma vie, et j'ay de la peine à croire que dans aucune cour de l'Europe, si on excepte celle de France, on puisse rien entreprendre de plus beau (l. 122).

The ceremony which so excited Galland's admiration was certainly imposing. Six divisions preceded the Sultan's own escort; first, the Keeper of the Seal and his escort; then the Defdar, or Minister of Finance; third, Ibrahim Pasha, who had governed Egypt, had been disgraced, and had repurchased his ground at Court; fourth, Mustapha Pasha, the Kaimakam of Adrianople; fifth, a favourite courtier and fellow-huntsman of the Sultan; and, sixth, the Grand Vizir, who was the most splendidly accompanied of all. Each of these divisions was preceded by two or more horsemen bearing white horsetails on the top of poles, relics of the symbolical yaks of the Mongols. Another man carried the long green silk standard, with the Arabic inscription in golden letters, "There is no god but God, and Mohammed is his prophet," and on the top of the pole a silver case, containing a miniature Koran. A company of well-mounted Delis followed the standard, dressed in green or yellow satin and tiger skins, and red or green hats, with broad brims turned up before and behind, decorated with aigrettes, and armed with lances and sabres. Next came a company of "the finest infantry that can be seen," five hundred Albanians, Bosnians, &c., well made, young, and lusty, armed with muskets and swords. After these rode horsemen, variously dressed and caparisoned, and Agas, with their following of youths in coats of mail and helmets, carrying bows and pikes; and then three mounted dervishes, holding sacred banners; whilst the young guard and a band of music brought up the rear. When these six magnificent cortèges had passed by,

the still more gorgeous detachment of the Grand Seigneur himself approached. Here Galland succumbs to the exigencies of the occasion. The subject is beyond him; it needs an angel's intellect to understand and communicate this wonder. Everything was on a vastly greater scale than in the preceding divisions. After a gorgeous troop of lawyers, and emirs, and grantees, and vizirs, of the highest rank and the most splendid equipments, came the camel covered with gold brocade on which was placed the Koran in its silver casket. Another camel caparisoned in green velvet carried a box with the picture of Mecca in it. Thirty mounted falconers, bird on wrist; seven horsemen, each with "a kind of tiger" on the croup, kept for the chase, and riding tamely, covered up with brocade; fifty greyhounds held in leash by janissaries; five or six huge bloodhounds, a dozen painted and decorated turnspits, twenty-five grooms leading splendidly caparisoned horses; and then the Grand Seigneur himself, riding alone, seated on a leopard-skin, clad in massive steel from head to foot, and blazing with precious stones; his sword, bow, and the ewer and basin for the ablutions of religion, were carried after him; and white eunuchs, white horses, carriages, and big drums, with forty of the flower of the guard, and a thousand spahis, completed this wonderful pageant, the description of which occupies twenty-two pages, and brings the enthusiastic spectator almost into conflict with the Académie for coining words expressive of such novel and unheard-of sights.

It is in descriptions like this that Galland's *Journal* becomes interesting and valuable. The account of the marriage of a dragoman's daughter and her sumptuous trousseau and splendid wedding presents (ii. 60) is curious, and the notes he made from time to time on the rites and dogmas of the Orthodox Church—a subject he was specially requested to study—possess some importance. He does not, however, seem to care much for the Greeks, whilst he cannot conceal his admiration for the Turks. It must be remembered that the Ottoman race was then comparatively young and vigorous; it was only two centuries since they had entered Europe, and their early strength and freshness were not yet enfeebled by luxury and sensuality. The Turks were still a nation of warriors when Galland saw them march to the attack on Poland. They had just taken Candia, and in ten years they would be before the walls of Vienna, to be beaten back only by the arms of Sobieski. There was something admirable about them then. Yet Galland's *Journal* contains many notes which reveal the same corrupt system of government that now disgraces the Ottoman Empire. The same deplorable principle of letting out provinces to farm, and the same consequent corruption and extortion, existed then as now. But Galland sees the bright side oftenest. Even when he speaks of the proverbial procrastination of Turkish diplomatists he speaks admiringly. Their method, he says, is very different from ours. With great prudence they avoid meeting negotiators face to face, for fear of being surprised by pressing arguments which they might find embarrassing to answer. The opponent can learn nothing from their gestures or features:—"Ils résistent pour se faire valoir, et ils veulent plutost estre vaincus par de fréquentes poursuites et par des sollicitations réitérées, que persuadés par de bons raisonnemens avant que d'accorder aucune chose." Some people, he adds, ascribe this to stupidity, or want of presence of mind, or self-distrust; but he himself is of opinion that it is pure wisdom. Altogether he finds much that is great in the Turks, and loses no opportunity of praising them. A good deal of his admiration, however, must be attributed to a very superficial knowledge.

M. Schefer has edited the *Journal* with immense care. Every book that Galland sees or buys has a note of explanation attached to it by the editor, and every person mentioned is duly identified where identification is possible. Even a ship's crew is detailed. All we can regret is that so much pains should have been expended on so insignificant a subject. In nine cases out of ten the books and the persons were not worth identifying. But this remark applies to the whole work. It may be useful to a specialist who is working out the history of the foreign policy of France, but he might perfectly well have consulted it in manuscript. To anybody else the *Journal* must prove wearisome reading, and after toiling through it one has not even the satisfaction of feeling that he has learned anything particularly worth learning.

ART IN METAL.*

ALTHOUGH the pictures in this magnificent volume are of much greater importance than the letterpress, it cannot be said that M. Ménard has in any respect failed in the historical part of his work. It is probable that no account of art in metal so complete has yet been published. The illustrations are of a character seldom seen in books of this kind, and it will not be praising them too much to say that they are exact as well as artistic. Some of the etchings, in particular, are quite worthy of being framed and hung up as pictures, while to the practical metal-worker they are valuable as accurately representing beautiful objects. Some are, of course, more pictorial than others. Of the two prints of the Colleoni monument at Venice, the second is the prettiest in this respect; but M. Gaucherel is excelled by M. Lalauze, who, in his representation of M. Guillaume's busts of the Gracchi, has reached the highest point attained in any of the

etchings. This group—for so it must be called—is the property of the French nation, and is well known to visitors to the Luxembourg. The brothers are represented to the waist, standing side by side, the hand of one resting on the shoulder of the other, while the two right hands meet on an inscribed roll. The bronze is highly polished in places, and the whole work, even as represented in the print, is full of an impressive pathos amounting almost to sublimity—a characteristic which French sculptors are constantly striving after, but can seldom be said to have so nearly reached. Another modern French bronze is represented in the next plate. This is M. Degeorge's bust of Henri Regnault, the ill-fated painter. The etching is by M. Martinez, but its chief merit is of a merely technical kind—the difference between the tint and texture of bronze, black marble, and white marble being admirably rendered; but this is not high art, and there is a certain want, whether due to the sculptor or the engraver we cannot say, in the expression of the face, and in the management of the light. A fine work also is M. Martinez's representation of Cellini's bust of Cosmo I. at Florence. The inlaid eyeballs here give the engraver a better chance of rendering the expression. A woodcut on p. 171 is, however, perhaps the best picture of a bronze in the whole book. It represents Bernini's Neptune, and shows that life is still flickering among French wood-engravers. Can we say as much for England? We have dwelt on these representations of bronzes both on account of the difficulty they present to the artist and because M. Ménard's coadjutors have so successfully overcome it. There are many other engravings scattered through the book, separately printed or in the text, of which some are poor enough, but the average standard is high.

M. Ménard, in his historical chapters, begins at the beginning. It is in Egypt, he says in his opening sentences, that the most ancient metallic work is to be found—the most ancient, that is, to which an approximate date may be assigned. He describes several figures in bronze which were exhibited at the Trocadero in 1878, and which cannot be much later than the Pyramids. These objects were sent for the Exhibition by the Khedive, and few or none of so early a period are to be seen in European museums. Unfortunately, too, a great many of the bronzes and other curiosities of art brought to Northern Europe by collectors and travellers cannot be dated with any certainty. M. Ménard remarks on the stiffness of Egyptian sculpture in representing the human figure, and its comparative ease in representing animals; but he would have withdrawn this opinion had he been acquainted with the early art, of which nothing is known in England and France, and very little in Germany. Under the Eighteenth Dynasty he finds works in gold and silver which may be classed among the *chefs-d'œuvre* of jewelry. The Louvre possesses some beautiful works in gold of the time of Osorkon, but M. Ménard does not mention the much earlier and more interesting jewels taken from the mummy of Kamus, the son of Rameses II., and conveyed to Paris by M. Mariette. M. Ménard has some interesting notes on the Phœnicians. He asserts that they brought their tin, so necessary to the manufacture of bronze, at first by caravans from the Caucasus, and when Assyria stopped the way they sent their ships to Spain for it, and finally to Britain, "à l'endroit où est aujourd'hui le comté de Cornwall." Some silver cups of Phœnician manufacture are in the Louvre. They were found in Cyprus, and some collars and armlets at Sidon; but such objects are very rare. Of the Hebrew jewellers M. Ménard does not seem to have much opinion, and he expresses a characteristically French scepticism as to the narrative of the Exodus. It is impossible to prove that the Jews ever had a style of their own, and not a single ancient object has ever been found which could with certainty be attributed to them. Passing briefly over the metal-work of Assyria, Chaldea, and Persia, M. Ménard gives us an interesting and well-summarized account of the gold objects found by Dr. Schliemann at Mycenæ. But not one of them would authorize us, he considers, to fancy that the celebrated shield of Achilles was anything but a work of poetical imagination. The bellows of Vulcan, as described by Homer, must have been of very primitive construction, and incapable of giving a continuous blast. He next notices the early existence of the art of casting in bronze, especially at Corinth, but does not cite the existence of any examples older than those found at Herculaneum, and now in the Naples Museum. Of these he treats at considerable length, and illustrates his remarks with many pictures, including one of the famous colossal horse's head and one of the beautiful "Narcissus." Of Etruscan work, too, he has much to say, and there is a fine engraving of the well-known "Orator" in the Florence Museum. The art of Rome is, he observes, merely a continuation or transformation of what had gone before in Greece and Etruria.

The art in metal-work of the middle ages is illustrated by examples of Byzantine jewelry, and by monstrances, reliquaries, and other objects for religious uses. This is, however, the least interesting part of the book. M. Ménard longs to get on to the Renaissance, and is evidently more at home in Italy than in Germany. He falls into the usual French error of considering the jewels of Charlemagne as belonging to France; but he is on safer ground when he comes to speak of enamelling. Of English metal-work in the middle ages he is evidently completely ignorant, and gives us only some notes on Irish reliquaries, and an account, extremely brief, of the rarity of "orifrevers religieux" in England. He has evidently never heard of the Mayer Museum, or of "King Alfred's Jewel," or of the writings of Mr. Crippa. He does us justice some pages further on, when he comes to write of the silver plate of the last century, and presents us with a great many cuts of

* *Histoire Artistique du Métal*. Par René Ménard. Paris and London: Librairie de l'Art. 1881.

sugar bowls, teapots, and other articles "en argent repoussé, travail Anglais." He also, unfortunately for us, engraves a specimen of the modern racing "cup," which takes away some of the credit we might have gained from the Queen Anne silver. Besides very complete accounts of enamel and of Japanese metal-work, there is a chapter on furniture, and the application to it for decorative purposes of bronze, brass, and *or moulu*. The illustrations of this part of the book are particularly taking. M. Ménard tells us that the celebrated Boulle (*sic*) was one of a family of artists who flourished all through the seventeenth century. The most eminent was André-Charles Boulle, son of John and nephew of Peter Boulle, who were both lodged in the Louvre, and bore the title of "*menuisiers du roy*." André-Charles lived to be ninety, and died in the Louvre in 1732. One of his works is a marriage coffer, ordered by Louis XIV. for his son, the "Grand Dauphin," who took it with him to Meudon, where he died. It went into private hands, and eventually became part of the San Donato collection, lately sold at Florence. Créscent and his son were the successors of the Bouilles, and acquired a great reputation under the Regent. The style which we call "Empire" really came in under Louis XVI., and M. Ménard figures a beautiful table or "console" by Riesener, in black wood with marble top. The legs are surmounted by capitals in gilt metal of the Doric order, and wreathed with exquisite laurel wreaths. The outline of this piece of furniture is as plain and stiff as possible, but the applied metal-work is of the most lavishly decorated kind. The last few pages of the book are devoted to the subject of embroidery in gold and silver. Here the engravings, though executed with the greatest care, fail to give any but a very inadequate idea of the work represented. They consist of five altar-cloths of various periods, one decorated with a Spanish coat of arms.

It will have been seen that there are few departments of art on which M. Ménard has not something to say when writing of "Metal." The fact is that he might have made the whole book out of any one of them; and it is a question how far collections of this kind are useful. In the present case the good taste which has kept out almost everything not in itself beautiful has made this a pretty book, and one to be read and turned over with pleasure. It would be gratifying to the critic to be able to say more in favour of a costly and magnificent work, but we have not found enough of any one subject in it to make it really interesting; and the mere turning over of picture-books, though it gives one the idea of learning, is in reality almost a waste of time. It is difficult or impossible to generalize from pages which begin with the bronze-work of the Pyramid-builders and end with the embroidery of Flemish nuns. True, we rise from a study of M. Ménard with a feeling that good art is wonderfully alike in all styles; that the Etruscan orator has characteristics very much in common with the Italian John Baptist of the middle ages, and the modern French Gracchi. The universal and omnivorous taste of the present day will admit the charms of a mediæval reliquary as readily as those of a Lamerie *épergne* or a Riesener console. How far the publication of books like this, which we perceive is issued at the cost and charges of a "Société de propagation des livres d'art," will really influence the taste of the future it would not be easy to say. The artist must know so much nowadays that it is to be feared that too often any originality he ever had is smothered and overlaid. The mere effort to break loose from the trammels of bygone fashions and styles is greater than most men can make. Even such a genius as Stevens displeases us as often as he pleases when he strives for originality and only attains eccentricity. It is no wonder, then, that the employers of artists prefer mediocrity. The imitator of great and good work succeeds where brilliancy is out of place. The general public will always rank the Albert Memorial above the Wellington Monument; but the dissemination of books like this of M. Ménard will at least furnish the minority with reasons to justify their æsthetic preferences.

WITH THE KURRAM FIELD FORCE.*

THIS volume contains, in addition to much which is not only valuable but worthy of permanent record, an extraordinary amount of extremely uninteresting detail. The explanation of the system on which the author proceeded is thus given:—"The diary form of narrative has been retained, as it enables the orders affecting the force, published from time to time, to be given in their original form. It would have been possible to have placed all the orders in the narrative by describing the results; but, though more continuity in the account would have been gained by so doing, yet it would have been only possible by losing the brevity and clearness with which facts are described in an Order Book." What we get then is a copious "Quartermaster-General's Journal," interspersed with circulars of "Military Controllers" and "Commissaries-General," &c. &c., chapter and verse being given for the minutest incidents. We are told that the facts recorded "may prove useful to the future historian," but readers generally prefer a book in which they can take a present interest. Who was appointed postmaster, in which village, and how long he worked the post, the wanderings of one or two camels out of ten thousand, how much or how little certain doolie-bearers were to eat at dif-

ferent times, how battery-cooks were dressed as the season advanced, at what hour the General rode out on various occasions and the precise minute of his return, and a multitude of like minutiae—what conceivable interest can such have for readers? and how will they benefit the "future historian"?

The author is better occupied when he treats of so important a subject as that of the transport question; and he has given us some valuable statistics, a study of which may help the Indian authorities in determining upon the best system to be definitively adopted in connexion with the operations of a field army. The first desideratum undoubtedly is that there should be a system of some kind. The carriage establishment of an army on the march in India is an agglomeration of the most varied *personnel* and *matériel*. It is collected from all quarters, and usually hurriedly. Animals of all sorts are enlisted for work, with little regard to whether it is the kind they are fitted for, and shoals of scoundrels are enlisted to look after them; some British officers are selected, with more or less reference to their capacity for the business, to superintend the mixed multitude, and the organization is then supposed to be in smooth working order. Of all animals to take into rough mountain country, with heavy burdens, too, on their backs, camels are the worst. They are sensitive to cold, bad climbers, squat down when they fancy, won't get up again for blows or persuasion, and always die in the middle of a public thoroughfare. They died like flies in this expedition. The Adjutant-General to the Kurram force attributes the excessive mortality to the following causes:—(1) the climate was not suited to them; (2) the grazing was scanty, and not what the camels were accustomed to; (3) camels frequently remained loaded from 5.30 A.M. to 4, 6, and 11 P.M., and had nothing to eat on arrival at camping grounds. The writer adds that not more than half were properly clothed. Under these circumstances, it is small wonder that, at the end of seven months only, no more than 4,344 of these animals, out of a total of 13,840 enlisted from time to time, remained to the good. Mules and ponies were, as a rule, better provided for, and their casualties amounted in the same period to little over one-tenth of their number.

It is of course impossible to separate the question of transport from that of the employment of non-combatant followers in the field. The effective strength of the Kurram force on January 1, 1879, amounted to 1,860 European and 5,392 native combatants, or a total of 7,252 men. To this small body were attached no less than 5,709 followers. Those who have never seen an army on the move in Eastern countries will be puzzled to know what purposes such a host of servants can answer. There are first the public followers, who are employed in hospital establishments, doolie-bearers, camel and mule men attached to regiments, the syces and grass-cutters taken with the artillery and cavalry. Private followers include regimental cooks, barbers, sweepers and blustees, officers' servants, syces, &c. This heavy total of 5,709 followers, it should be added, represented only the number considered "absolutely indispensable." It was "reduced to the lowest possible point." The author is of opinion that it would be undoubtedly feasible for a force to do without followers of any description; but, he adds, that it must be at the expense of reducing the fighting strength, abolishing a good many of the present hospital arrangements and part of the camp equipage, and making each man carry his own kit. "To draw the line between efficiency on the one hand, and the reduction of followers on the other, is a problem yet to be solved, and its solution would be much facilitated by the institution of a permanent transport department."

The writer draws attention to the question of shoeing horses in the field, and shows that the arrangements for peace-time are unsuited to campaign work. In British regiments and batteries iron for shoeing is provided by the farrier-sergeant when the battery or regiment is in cantonments; but if an order to march at short notice arrives, there being no arrangement for the carriage of iron, the greatest inconvenience is apt to arise. As the campaign in the Kurram Valley proceeded, the Ordnance Department made arrangements both for the supply of horse-shoes and iron from England, but when the shoes came out they were too small for any but the small horses of the native cavalry.

We notice that orders were early given that every regiment should start as completely provided as possible with intrenching tools. It would be interesting to know if the admirable opportunities open to the garrisons of nearly every station in India to become practically acquainted with the art of throwing up entrenchments are yet turned to any account. Instinct teaches soldiers who have had little experience of disciplined manoeuvre to utilize ground for cover; but it would seem as though old habits of methodical drill, and skirmishing according to book and not according to *terrain*, had unfitted the British soldier for intelligent appreciation of the, to some extent, novel exigencies of modern war. There is nothing for it in the face of rifles but to seek out, improvise, or regularly construct cover of some kind. We are returning to the bush-fighting of savages on a vast scale. It is instructive to note that the superior leadership and discipline of the Germans availed them but little when pitted against the native tact of the French in village and what we have called bush-fighting. Nothing could have been more satisfactory than the cordial and thorough manner in which several of the Punjab chiefs lent their aid in the prosecution of the campaign. It is curious, as illustrating the extraordinary variety of terms on which we co-exist with the multitude of dependent, semi-dependent, and independent Indian States which go to

* *With the Kurram Field Force, 1878-9.* By Major J. A. S. Colquhoun, R.A. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1881.

compose the Empire, to read that each contingent furnished by the above-mentioned chiefs had its own Political officers. The Punjab troops were employed in making roads, garrisoning posts along the line of communications, and escorting convoys.

Though these troops suffered much from the inclemency of the weather, yet their hardships were borne without a murmur. All ranks performed their duties cheerfully, and displayed a soldier-like and most loyal spirit. From the time of the contingent leaving Lahore not a complaint of any kind was brought to the notice of either civil or military authorities against any one individual, either fighting men or camp follower.

Whatever may be advanced as to the impolicy of engaging at all in war with Afghanistan, it is certain we have carried back with us some valuable experience. We have discovered manifold shortcomings in our own military system, and have only been successful after a sad loss of life and a prodigal expenditure of money. But it has also been ascertained that there was growing up beyond the mountains a Power which was diligently bent on assimilating European military inventions, and which, if not distracted by international divisions, would at no distant time become a very thorn in our side. Our own armament was doubtless superior to that of the Afghans in the late conflict, but the latter were very fairly equipped. They had of course rifles and ammunition which we had kindly served out to them, but they used also arms of their own manufacture. It does not seem to be known for certain to what extent they were indebted for their skill in making and handling them to foreign instructors.

The brass ordnance captured were of excellent make and well-finished in every respect. . . . The ammunition for these guns was fairly made. . . . There were some Enfield rifle cartridges of their own make, which were a fair imitation of our own in everything except the powder. . . . The mountain guns, of which eleven were taken, were of the same pattern as the 150 lb. steel 7-pounder in our service, and rifled in the same way. . . . The shells for these guns were very fairly made, and the fuzes were made on our model. . . . The whole of their mountain-battery equipment was founded on our models.

The action of the Peiwar Kotal, a capital description of which is given in this volume, was one of the most creditably gained during the war. The enemy held what General Roberts has termed an "apparently impregnable position." It had been fortified with art. The ascent of the jungle-covered steeps was only practicable at certain points, and here stockades one behind another three or four deep had been thrown up, and the paths of approach blocked by abatis. "The Afghans had every advantage in their favour, as the only point—excepting, of course, the leadership and discipline—on our side was nullified by the conditions of the fight. Our long-range artillery could have but little effect on their position, while our rifles in close fighting were but slightly superior to the Enfield rifles opposed to them. . . . They had the knowledge of the ground, in which we were deficient; they had their own discipline, which was good, as they obeyed their leaders; and they had ample provisions and ammunition to continue the fight for many a day." General Roberts was justified in saying "The result is most honourable, and could only have been achieved by troops in a high state of discipline, capable of enduring great hardships, and able to fight as soldiers of the British army always have fought."

In concluding this notice, we must commend some excellent descriptions of country and a few neatly executed landscape sketches with which Major Colquhoun has embellished his volume. It may be remarked, however, that, as regards the illustration on p. 98, of the position taken up by the Afghans holding the Peiwar Kotal, it is impossible when so small a scale is used to give anything like an adequate representation of ground. A less artificial method of exhibiting gradients than that used under authority during the last ten years or so is much required by military draughtsmen, as all who have experience in hill-sketching will testify.

HOURS WITH THE PLAYERS.*

MR. DUTTON COOK has followed up his amusing *Book of the Play* with two volumes called *Hours with the Players*—the players commented on ranging from the ill-fated Will Mountford to Fechter. In a short preface the author puts forward with becoming modesty a claim for his work that it "contains more precise and complete memoirs of sundry of the performers it deals with than have previously been submitted to the public, or could be forthcoming without considerable diligence, search, and study"; and this is assuredly a claim which few readers of these pleasant volumes will be likely to contest. The writer goes on to observe that it will be easily seen in which cases he has written at second and in which at first hand. "Of course I was in some cases rather a juvenile witness, and not by any means an expert; yet, to pursue the figure, I knew the nature of an oath, and I trust my testimony as far as it goes may be accepted, therefore, as credible and trustworthy." In fact, Mr. Dutton Cook throws himself with such zest into his subject, whether he is dealing with early reminiscences or with carefully noted traditions, that we can readily imagine the same remark being made to him that was made to a keen playgoer of our acquaintance by an *interlogue* companion. "You, then, must have seen Mrs. Bracegirdle." For Mrs. Bracegirdle, of whom he says that she "seems to have been the first actress who succeeded in establish-

ing anything like a reputation for private worth and propriety of conduct," the author takes up very properly, as it seems to us, the cudgels against Lord Macaulay, whose passing estimate of her character is oddly characteristic:—"It was said of her that in the crowded theatre she had as many lovers as she had male spectators. Yet no lover, however rich, however high in rank, had prevailed on her to be mistress. . . . She seems to have been a cold, vain, and interested coquette, who perfectly understood how much the influence of her charms was increased by the fame of a severity which cost her nothing, and who could venture to flirt with a succession of admirers in the just confidence that no flame which she might kindle in them would thaw her own ice." This is a strange enough comment on a virtue which was then not too common, and most people will agree with Mr. Dutton Cook that it is "severe upon the actress."

As to the death of Will Mountford, the author, after reviewing the circumstances with care and patience, observes that

the public generally were of opinion that a grievous wrong had been done, for which some one ought to be punished; and, Will having escaped, why should not his friend Mohun suffer in his stead? . . . Mohun's share in the sad event could only "constructively" be regarded as murder. Certainly he had not struck the fatal blow. He stood apart, little more guilty than a second in a duel—to take the worst view of his case.

This is perhaps putting it a little strongly; but, on the whole, the view of the transaction at which Mr. Dutton Cook has arrived seems reasonable enough. In the same chapter there is a curious confirmation of the notion, which we have on former occasions expressed in these columns, that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the power of acting was, to use a paradox, accounted an extraordinary perfection in an actor. It was said of Mountford in *Sir Courtly Nice* that "he was no longer Mountford, but another person; he was not himself in voice, mien or gesture; the whole man was changed"; and it was this—then, as it seems, strange—faculty of impersonation which put the crown to his reputation.

All Mr. Dutton Cook's biographies in his first volume afford entertainment and agreeably conveyed information; but it is not easy to dwell upon them at any length without picking out the plums, which we do not propose to do. In an article on Palmer, the original Joseph Surface, a reference to that curiously scrappy and amusing book, Frederick Reynolds's *Memoirs*, contradicts a tradition as to the last words uttered by Palmer. He was playing *The Stranger* at Liverpool in 1798, and fell dead upon the stage in the fourth act. It was said at the time, and the legend is still current, that he died immediately after delivering the words, "There is another and a better world." Whitfield, however, an actor who was playing Baron Steinfort, told Reynolds "that Palmer fell suddenly before him on the stage while answering the inquiry as to the Stranger's children in the fourth act, and that his last words were really 'I left them at a small town hard by.'" The more striking form of the story sold fifteen hundred copies of the play, and was "most adroitly confirmed and hawked about the town as a means of enforcing the anti-dramatic tenets" of the Methodists. There was also a curious story, told in Mr. Richardson's *Recollections of the Last Half-Century*, of Palmer's "fetch" appearing at the hour of his death to a boy named Tucker, who slept in the house in Spring Gardens where Palmer lodged when in town. It may be noted that in a following chapter Mr. Dutton Cook does fuller justice than has often been done to "Gentleman Smith," whose chief fame rests upon his "creation" of the part of Charles Surface, but whose versatility both in tragedy and comedy must clearly have been remarkable.

More personal interest attaches, as the preface hints, to the second volume than the first, inasmuch as in some of its later chapters the author speaks as an eye-witness. But before we come to them it may be well to say something of a curiously interesting chapter devoted to "a gentleman of the name of Booth"—the father of the actor whose great powers were shown this year on the London boards. The story of the elder Booth's appearance in London, of Edmund Kean's seeming kindness in playing Othello to his Iago at the theatre where Kean was acting and where he caused Booth to be engaged, and of the complete eclipse of Booth which followed is tolerably well known. What was probably not known to or noted by many people until Mr. Dutton Cook recorded the fact, is that at the date of this eclipse Booth was little more than twenty years old. It may be that even so his performances in London were underrated—the influence of Kean was then paramount—but it seems in any case tolerably certain that in after years Booth displayed, to say the least, a remarkable talent. Mr. Dutton Cook quotes as to this some very interesting passages from a book called *The Tragedian*, by Mr. J. R. Gould, published in New York in 1868. The author writes forcibly and with evident insight, but is undoubtedly carried away by enthusiasm, although he does not make the fatal mistake of asserting that Booth was faultless. He possessed, Mr. Gould says, imagination "of a subtle kind, and in magnificent measure. It lent a weird expressiveness to his voice. It atmosphered his most terrific performances with beauty. Booth took up Kean at his best, and carried him further. Booth was Kean, plus the higher imagination." Mr. Gould, it will be observed, had never seen Kean, and the comparison, therefore, cannot be thought worth much; but from various detailed descriptions and criticisms of Booth, for which we refer readers to Mr. Dutton Cook's pages, it would seem that, when allowance has been made for enthusiasm, there is still evidence enough that Booth must have been a good deal more than a mere imitator. It should be noted also as to this that he forestalled Kean in playing Lear at Drury Lane,

* *Hours with the Players*. By Dutton Cook, Author of "A Book of the Play," "Art in England," &c. 2 vols. London: Chatto & Windus.

and that his performance was spoken of by Hazlitt in a way which may be held to mark the predisposition of his audience:—"We have seen Mr. Booth's *Lear* with great pleasure. . . . Mr. Kean's is a greater pleasure to come, as we anticipate."

The chapter on Booth is followed by one on "La belle Smithson," in which, after the Berlioz epidemic of last season, it is a little strange to find Mr. Dutton Cook writing:—"Some few of Berlioz's works find a place in our orchestral concerts, but the composer himself is little remembered in England." Perhaps the best, and certainly not the least interesting, of the chapters is that devoted to "Sir Charles Coldstream," which contains a full and nicely-judged account of the style and chief performances of the comedian whom the writer justly calls "unique, unrivalled, inimitable," in his own line:—

The histrionic fame [writes Mr. Dutton Cook] of Charles Mathews the second, however, arose from gifts and achievements which were peculiarly and independently his own. His success was of a personal and individual sort, and owed little or nothing to preceding exertions and examples. His method as an actor was not founded upon the method of any other actor. He was essentially a light comedian—the lightest of light comedians; but it was difficult to classify his art in relation to the art of others or to established technical conventions. He was distinguished for an extraordinary vivacity, an airy grace, an alert gaiety that exercised over his audience the effect of fascination. Elegance and humour so curiously combined can hardly have been seen upon the stage except in this instance. No doubt there was always risk of awarding admiration, not so much to the art of the comedian as to the natural endowments of the man; and it must often have happened that Charles Mathews was applauded for being something which he could not possibly help being. At the same time, it must not be assumed that he could only appear in his own character, or that his efforts upon the scene lacked variety. Certain graces of manner peculiar to himself he could never wholly discard; but his power of representation enabled him to exhibit distinct and finished portraits of personages so very different as *Sir Charles Coldstream* and *Sir Hugh Evans*, *Lavater* and *Mr. Affable Hawk*, *Slender* and *Duzzle*, *Young Widdling*, and the villainous heroes of "Black Sheep" and "The Day of Reckoning," to name no others.

Later on, contrasting M. Got's performance of Mercadet with Mathews's of Affable Hawk, Mr. Dutton Cook says that he is without information as to the method of Geoffroy, the original Mercadet. A French critic has observed that Geoffroy's version was far more like M. Got's than like Mathews's, "bien que son interprétation, caractérisée par une nuance de rondeur bon enfant, différât sensiblement de celle qui a prévalu à la Comédie Française." There are two little slips in the chapter we are now considering. We can find no special mention of Mathews's singular feat of acting in *Patter v. Clatter*, and we have the great Frédéric's name spelt without the final *k*; but for this probably the printer is responsible. We close the volumes, which end with a too brief "Note on Fechter," with a regret that Mr. Dutton Cook has not included in his pages Robson and some other players who have been more or less lately among us.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE JEWISH CHURCH.*

PROFESSOR ROBERTSON SMITH has appealed in these lectures from the smaller tribunal of a local ecclesiastical assembly, first to the judgment of a large number of Scottish hearers in Glasgow and Edinburgh, and next to that of the general body of educated and thoughtful readers. The lectures "were written, delivered, and printed during the first three months of the present year," having "their origin in the invitation of some six hundred prominent Free Churchmen, who deemed it better that the Scottish public should have an opportunity of understanding the position of the newer criticism than that they should condemn it unheard." The author rightly urges as "of the first importance that the reader should realize that Biblical criticism is not the invention of modern scholars, but the legitimate interpretation of historical facts"; though the meaning of the sentence would have been more clear if he had described such "legitimate interpretation" as the aim and object of the criticism, or, in other words, of "progressive Biblical science" in all ages. Every ecclesiastical school and every commentator on Scripture is ready to assert that his or their opinion on any matter of Biblical controversy is the one and only "legitimate interpretation" of fact, or doctrine, or prophecy, as the case may be. Professor Smith is necessarily to some extent influenced by such a bias; but, on the whole, his lectures present a very important question of historical criticism, from his own point of view, in a fair, and always calm and dispassionate, mode of statement. By his opponents it will at once be objected that he has put one of their strongest grounds of opposition entirely out of sight; and this we may presume to have been deliberately intended. It is possible that his answer to such an objection may be reserved for a future publication; meanwhile, in the present course of lectures, the argument of probability is based on Old Testament grounds only, and the testimony of the New Testament to the authorship and historical value of the earlier Scriptures is not discussed in any way. It cannot be fairly alleged against Mr. Smith, whatever may be the rhetorical weapons which party bitterness may use against him, that he approaches his subject in any sceptical or unbelieving spirit. On the contrary, the most explicit statements of his belief in the Old Testament as a Divine revelation are to be met with throughout. It may be sufficient to quote, as an instance, the following sentence, which occurs early in the first lecture:—

The Reformation . . . brought the Bible to the front as a living

means of grace; not, as is sometimes superficially imagined, by placing the infallible Bible in the room of the infallible Church, but by a change in the whole conception of faith, of the plan and purpose of revelation, and of the operation of the means of grace.

This may be true of the motive of the Reformers, as the term will be understood by a Scotch Presbyterian; but it is no less true that the popular religious mind is in all ages superficial, and it is probable that, as a fact, the implicit reliance on an infallible Church was popularly replaced to a large extent by reliance on an infallible and therefore uncriticized Book. Nor would the change in common opinion be so great as may at first sight appear. For belief in the existence of an infallible book must presuppose the existence, in some form, of an infallible Church or society of men so far divinely guided as to be, in respect of the reception and tradition of such a book, free from error. And this we may assume to be the current belief of ordinary Protestantism both in England and Scotland, which accepts the Old Testament as a whole on apostolic, and higher than apostolic, authority in the New; and the New Testament in its turn partly upon apostolic and evangelistic authority, and partly on some implied, and perhaps almost unrecognized, ecclesiastical and sub-apostolic authority by which the acts and writings of Apostles and Evangelists were distinguished and attested. It has, for instance, been a not uncommon opinion in recent times that, as all St. Paul's Epistles must have been inspired, it is impossible that any Epistle of St. Paul can have been lost. Behind the critical opponents to the reception of any new opinions as to the authorship, date, or character of the sacred records, there will always be gathered a vast mass of uncritical repugnance to any questioning of the basis upon which the traditional belief as to Scripture rests. Thus, while it is possible for thoughtful and learned men like Professor Smith to accept as equally the Divine law a code of ceremonial precepts whether its date may have been earlier or later by a thousand years, the bare suggestion of an erroneous tradition as to date or authorship is enough, with the great mass of ordinary religious opinion, to imply an utter subversion of the foundations of faith. Admitting, in the face of this prejudgment of the question, that the author may have had good reasons for postponing any reference to the New Testament, we think that the actual opening of his argument has been well chosen in the preliminary inquiry as to what is the origin and character of the received text of the Hebrew Scriptures. This text is commonly known to have been preserved with such scrupulous care that even interlineations in the MS. were reproduced, and that the copies almost resembled the facsimile of a photograph. The existence of various readings was thus made impossible, and a widely-received belief assumes this uniformity to have come down from the date of the original writings. In his third lecture, Professor Smith supports by a careful argument his conclusion "that the fixing of a standard text took place about the apostolic age, or rather a little later than that date, and not at any earlier time." He attributes this work to the Scribes, whose "objects were legal, not philological." "When this text was fixed, the discordant copies must have been rigorously suppressed. The evidence for this is only circumstantial, but it is quite sufficient." Previously to this settlement, "we can be sure that copies of the Bible circulated, and were freely read even by learned men, which had great and notable variations of text"; an assertion which, in the fourth lecture, the author goes on to justify by evidence afforded in the Septuagint. The inference to be drawn from this argument is obvious; since, if the facts are historically certain, and if the Christian Church is unable to attribute inspiration to Jewish Scribes in and after the apostolic age, no such Divine sanction can be claimed for the received text of the Old Testament as would place it beyond the range of philological criticism.

From the text the next succeeding lectures pass to the Canon and its history; and here Professor Smith's guiding principle, "We receive the Bible as the record of revelation," separates him distinctly from the school of critics to whom the Canon is nothing but a collection of writings, chosen, edited, and published according to the literary, political, or ecclesiastical tendencies of Jewish authorities in the later centuries before the Christian era. But in these centuries the Canon was practically confined within "the fixed dimensions in which we now possess it," although its authoritative definition by the Rabbins of Palestine, to the exclusion of all Apocrypha, cannot, in the author's opinion, be dated earlier than the close of the first century A.D. The Jews, of course, accepted this decision; "but Christian theology could not give weight to Rabbinical tradition, and it is thus very natural that many attempts have been made to prove that an authoritative Canon was fixed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, while the last prophets still lived." Such attempts, Professor Smith thinks, have failed; and, as he admits at the same time that inspired prophecy had died out, he is of necessity thrown back on a position corresponding to that occupied by Aristotle in his celebrated definition of virtue, where the enlightened conscience of the *φρόνιμος* becomes in moral action the court of final appeal:—

The great mass of the Old Testament books gained their canonical position because they commended themselves in practice to the experience of the Old Testament Church and the spiritual discernment of the godly in Israel. . . . The judgment which theological prejudice might pass on the several books of the record of revelation was controlled by the practical experience of those who found in the Scriptures food for their own daily life; and so in God's providence a result was attained which rested on sounder principles than those of the schools. Throughout the history of the Church it has always been found that the silent experience of the pious people of God has been truer, and has led the Church in a safer path, than the public decrees of those who claim to be authoritative leaders of theological thought.

* *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church: Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism.* By W. Robertson Smith, M.A. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1881.

Such a position, irrespectively of its abstract strength, places the man who desires to propound it between two fires, and calls for the exhibition of great courage and great calmness in creditably maintaining it. In neither of these qualities has Professor Smith shown himself deficient; and in the succeeding lectures he goes on to argue that from this position it is open to a firm believer in Divine revelation to question, and if necessary to contradict, traditional beliefs concerning the date and authorship of many portions of the Old Testament Canon, and to set up in their room, and attempt to establish by proof, the hypothesis that the statute law of Israel must have corresponded to the codes of other nations in the characteristics of variation and progress corresponding with the life and circumstances of the people. The elaborate and detailed argument of the lectures directed to this object does not admit of condensation; but its conclusions lead to a supposed threefold division of the Torah or Law of the Old Testament. Of these, the first is held to be Mosaic, and to contain, in addition to the Decalogue, the code belonging to the wilderness and the early settlement in Canaan; the second Deuteronomic, and to represent the law as laid down by the prophets, and framed as a body of statutes in or about the seventh century B.C.; while the third, or Levitical code, is the law of the Second Temple, of which the basis may be traced in the prophecy of Ezekiel, but which was not developed in its details earlier than the time of Ezra, and perhaps not completed then. "But while the historical student is thus compelled to speak of the ritual code as the law of the Second Temple, it would be a great mistake to think of it as altogether new. Ezekiel's ordinances are nothing else than a reshaping of the old priestly Torah, and a close study of the Levitical laws shows that many ancient Torahs were worked up, by successive processes, into the complete system as we now possess it." A parallel saving clause guards Professor Smith from being supposed to share "the idea of some critics that the Deuteronomic code was a forgery of the Temple priests or of their head, the high priest Hilkiah," which he holds to be "effectually disproved" by the code itself. As, however, he considers that "it was not known to Isaiah, and therefore the reforms of Hezekiah cannot have been based upon it," it may with some reason be objected that an imputation of "forgery" is not disproved by the acquittal of persons hastily charged with it; and that the term, if applicable at all, belongs as much to the framers of the code on Professor Smith's theory as to the Temple priests on the theory which he rejects. In urging the familiar difficulty that many rules of ceremonial and worship contained in the Pentateuch are shown to have been systematically broken in the history of the nation, and that there is no evidence that their existence was at the time even recognized, Professor Smith is fully within his rights as an orthodox Biblical student. His inference is, indeed, open to the reply, which we do not observe him to have anticipated, that the same negative evidence might be alleged against the existence of the Passover, or Feast of Unleavened Bread, as an institution, which he himself assigns to the period of the first, or Mosaic, legislation. But he is not within his rights where he argues, incidentally and perhaps by an oversight, against the existence of a written law in the age of Samuel. "If it lay neglected in some corner of the Sanctuary, who rescued it when the Philistines destroyed the Temple (in Shiloh) after the battle of Ebenezer?" Into no part of the Old Testament history does the miraculous intervention in which Professor Smith firmly believes enter more distinctly than during this period; and it is an assumption of the question at issue to set aside the possibility of the preservation of a "written priestly Torah" coincidently with the recorded preservation of the Tables of the Law of Sinai.

It is not within our province to offer any opinion on the theological bearing of the hypotheses defended in these lectures. But it is evident that the issues raised are of a character differing materially from those of ordinary historical criticism. The most contradictory and unheard-of theories about the succession of dynasties in Egypt, or the age of the Pyramids, may be maintained without the slightest practical influence upon the course of modern life and thought; but received opinions upon the subjects discussed in these lectures could not be overturned without involving a reconstruction of the doctrinal systems of many existing religious bodies. Behind the question, whether the historical probability in favour of theories such as are here advocated is sufficiently strong to give them a recognized place in the literature of criticism, lies that of their influence on society generally; and the responsible officers of ecclesiastical communities can hardly be expected to exhibit towards them a receptive frame of mind, even at the risk of being classed with "Scribes" and "Pharisees" among "those who claim to be authoritative leaders of theological thought."

MISSING PROOFS.*

WE always read Miss Stirling's stories with pleasure. She happily keeps free from most of the faults into which so many of her sister novelists fall, and she has merits of her own. She does not ill-use her native language, neither is she one of those who think that, so long as the author provides big enough words,

it is the duty of his reader to find a meaning for them. Considering the times in which she lives, she is sparing in her descriptions of nature, and, where she is somewhat minute in describing a scene, it will commonly be found that she has some reasonable end in view. Thus she sets clearly before us a view of the sea-coast of Pembrokeshire. "Chasms," she tells us, "yawn in the downs, so hidden by brambles and feathery grasses that an unwary walker may step over their treacherous edges, and drop down sixty sheer feet of rock on to the sand below, where the driven sea-foam lies thick and pale." Of course we know at once that through one of these chasms, before the end of the story is reached, some one of the characters who is in the way, both of the heroine and of the author, will be at the right moment dropped. The description, therefore, instead of wearying us, as descriptions so commonly do, only cheers us up, by inspiring us with fresh interest. We survey the group of characters, and begin to speculate for whom it is that the chasms exist. For the villain—of course a lady's story has a villain, one very deeply dyed moreover—they can, it would seem, scarcely be needed, since he was far away in India serving with his regiment against some desperate Bhotanees, and had convenient modes of death enough on every hand. There was a virtuous nobleman, whose life seemed to us uncertain, as, if he were removed, the injured heroine's little son would in that case be only separated by one other life from the family title. There was besides a very hateful, but outwardly attractive, young lady who was ensnaring the virtuous nobleman, and who seemed almost certain, unless he or she were killed, of winning his hand and sharing his title. We could even imagine one or two others who, though less in the way, might nevertheless have been thought not unworthy of a drop down a chasm so as to help on the plot. In like manner we have a full description given of Hungerford foot-bridge on a foggy night, and of the turbid river that flowed beneath it. But here, too, we do not for one moment complain, as the scene is not painted till the heroine was on the point of drowning herself. When a very interesting and lovely young lady in a fit of despair throws herself into the Thames, then surely an author deserves not only indulgence, but actual praise, who checks her narrative in order to describe all that her heroine might have noticed, and in fact perhaps did notice. What does excite our impatience is when, as is so commonly the case, novelists make use of their descriptions much in the same way as stingy but ostentatious hostesses make use of their services of plate, merely to hide the scantiness and the meanness of the food that is set before the guests. It may, perhaps, be chiefly due to this absence of descriptive writing that the reader is so fortunate as to get *Missing Proofs* told in only two volumes. What a relief it always is to escape the third volume, and how well inclined do we from the very first feel towards a writer who shows that she intends to let us off so easily! A short visit to one's dentist is a great delight, and so is a quick passage across the Channel. Perhaps a greater delight even than these is a sermon that lasts but ten minutes when we had looked for one that would keep us at least three-quarters of an hour. But to the reviewer pleasanter even than a sermon that is short, than a sea-passage that is brief, and than the stopping of a tooth that is soon got over, is a novel that is shorn of its third volume. We take it up with a feeling of goodwill, we begin to read it in the hope that we shall be pleased, and however dull we may have found it, we lay it down with some feeling of gratitude towards an author who has only bestowed on us but two-thirds of his tediousness.

We must, however, at once acquit Miss Stirling of being tedious, and confess that we are only speaking in general terms. *Missing Proofs* is certainly an interesting story, though it is in many ways a very faulty one. Of all the author's novels that we remember to have read, it is the one that has, on the whole, given us least pleasure. It is certainly better, in one respect, than *The Grahams of Invermoy*, which we noticed a year or two ago, for that tale was somewhat spun out. On the other hand, it does not contain, as all her other stories have contained, any very interesting character. There is not a single young lady with whom an old reviewer can fall in love, and this, we can assure Miss Stirling, we feel to be a great privation. No one, we verily believe, loses his heart more easily than a veteran critic, though perhaps no one more easily and rapidly recovers it. Unhappily, so numerous are the heroines by whom he is charmed, that he retains no clear remembrance of any one of them—even their very names slip his treacherous memory. Nevertheless, he looks upon himself as hardly used should a single week pass by without adding one to the list of those who have overcome him. Now the heroine of *Missing Proofs*, Lizzie Mayhew, has, no doubt, considerable merits of her own, though we must protest against the colour of her eyes. Brown is as good a colour for any heroine's eyes as we could wish for—far better than the violet that is at present in fashion, though not in nature. Nevertheless, when the author tells us that Lizzie's eyes were the brown of a Highland torrent-stream, we felt that she might have very easily found a clearer and a pleasanter shade of colour. The skin of a brown bear, or the edges of the crust of a well-baked pie, would have done far better than a stream discoloured by peat. But, passing from the eyes, there is still a greater drawback in the heroine. She gets married before the story is two chapters old, and she marries one of those cold-blooded, handsome officers who have greatly flourished ever since the days of *Vanity Fair* and *George Osborne*. Now we do like, we are ready to confess, to keep our heroines unmarried till close upon the very

* *Missing Proofs: a Pembrokeshire Tale*. By M. C. Stirling, Author of "The Grahams of Invermoy," &c. 2 vols. London & Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. 1881.

end of the story. We like, as it were, to feel that there is some hope left even for us, and that we may be able, in spite of all his advantages and our disadvantages, to cut out the most dashing young hero and to carry off the charming heroine for ourself. Certainly there is some gain to be set off on the other side by this early marriage. The story does not run on in the common rut in which the girl's heart is won even before the reader makes her acquaintance. Miss Stirling, likely enough, felt that a change would be agreeable, if not to her readers, at all events to herself, and so she sought a fresh plot. The villain—for a villain, in spite of some very tardy and very imperfect penitence, Laurence Dempster certainly was—so contrives his marriage that the proofs of it can, if he wishes, be without much difficulty destroyed. He has not made up his mind to cast away his wife, but from the first he wishes to be able to do so should he find it convenient. He is cousin to a nobleman, while she is the daughter of a poor schoolmaster, who has become blind. Moreover, he has one of those rich old aunts who, by the expectations that they raise, so often lead their nephews into acts of villany. If he displeased her by his marriage, he would, he well knew, be struck out of her will. He never, therefore, acknowledged his wife, and when at last, stung by the scorn that was cast upon her, she says that she will claim her rightful position, he defies her to prove that she is married. She soon finds that the proofs are indeed missing. Certainly by a woman who knew the world, with the help of a lawyer, the difficulty would have been without much trouble surmounted; but Lizzie was as ignorant as a child. She had passed her youth in a country village, and after her marriage she had been kept by her husband under an assumed name in retired lodgings in the town in which his regiment was quartered. The troubles that she suffers during the period of his neglect of her are described with considerable power. One lady only came to see her—the wife of a brother officer who knew the state of the case. On leaving, “thinking it best to make the position clear at once,” she begged Lizzie not to think herself bound to return her call:—

“I know nothing about returning calls, Mrs. Loch,” said Lizzie, impudently—“neither when one should go, nor how long one should stay, nor what to do with visiting-cards. Laurence talks about society till I feel as if there were a great gulf between me and it that I shall never learn to pass. Are people—ladies and gentlemen—so very unkind? I used to think their lives must be so pleasant, and sunshiny, and gentle. Would they be so severe if I made blunders?”

“Poor child,” said Nelly, compassionately, thinking how society would surely judge in this case. “The very best people are neither unkind nor harsh; but then there are so few of them. I’m afraid many of one’s acquaintances would criticize a blunder far more severely than it deserves.”

“Then you are one of the best people,” said Lizzie, smiling.

“! Oh dear, no—not in the sense I meant. I am nobody in this society that alarms you so.”

Lizzie opened her eyes. “I never shall understand, and sometimes I am so afraid, that I grow almost content to live in this way.”

Before long her husband quarrels with her, and to escape from her reproaches changes into a regiment that is bound for India. He leaves, however, money enough to provide decently for her and their infant son. She becomes desperate, and, as we have said, at last finds her way on to Hungerford Bridge on a foggy night. The chapter in which this scene is described ends with a rough “bargee” saying to his mate, “Poor lass, poor lass! she was a main good-lookin’ un, she was.” So far the story, if it takes a melancholy turn for the unhappy heroine, yet, from the reader's point of view, has gone on pleasantly enough, while a fresh and not unpleasant prospect seems to open before him. The heroine does, indeed, seem to have played her part; but heroines have died before, and yet the tale has not greatly suffered. There was still the villainous father left, and left in a place so convenient as India for a rapid death preceded by a scarcely less rapid repentance. But, far more interesting than any villain on the face of the earth, there was the much-wronged infant son, with the chance of a peerage before him could the missing proofs be found. Material enough was provided, we should have thought, to carry the story to an easy issue; but the author was not satisfied, and so made use of that well-known character the twin sister. This young lady—who had, we must not forget to say, two devoted lovers of her own—took advantage of the striking likeness that there was between her and her sister to assume her name, and to pass herself off as the mother of the deserted boy. It was, we must point out, the assumed name that she took, for Mrs. Dempster had been hitherto known only as Mrs. Davis, and it was Mrs. Davis that Judith Mayhew pretended to be. This part of the story struck us as being both laboured and unnatural. In fact, Judith, in the second volume at all events, is a nuisance, and by no means deserves the dashing and honourable young naval officer whom in the end she wins for a husband. Her first attempt had been to trace her sister, whom she had followed up to London, and to learn her fate. But not a word can she hear of her for some years. She had applied to the police, but no information could be got from them. The reader begins to suspect that his interpretation of the “bargee's” words might have been a mistaken one. Whether the heroine was drowned or was not; whether, assuming for a moment that she was rescued from the Thames, she was delivered from her husband; whether, on the assumption that she was delivered from her husband, she got a second and a better one; whether the missing proofs were ever found, or are still missing, all that should not be disclosed by us. If the reader's curiosity is roused, it is not for us

to satisfy it. There are circulating libraries and leisure days, and we shall not rob our author of her right to wind up her story in her own words, and to supply herself, if they are to be supplied, the proofs that are missing.

RECENT VERSE.*

MR. ARTHUR O'SHAUGHNESSY'S premature death this spring, at the age of thirty-seven, gave a pathetic force to the anticipation with which we looked forward to this posthumous volume of *Songs of a Worker*, on which he was known to have been engaged for eight years. Mr. O'Shaughnessy was the first writer of any promise who succeeded the almost simultaneous appearance of Messrs. Swinburne, Morris, and Rossetti; and his early poems, though much weaker than theirs, had a flavour and individuality of their own, which ensured them a hearing. His *Epic of Women*, to which we gave an early welcome in these columns, was as promising a first volume as any young poet has put forth in our time, except Mr. Morris's *Defence of Guenevere*. It had a singularly delicate music of its own, a very simple diction and limpid style, and a vein of mysticism which was full of charm. “The Fountain of Tears,” “Barcarolle,” and “A Neglected Harp,” are lyrics which seem to us now quite as original and beautiful as they did eleven years ago. But Mr. O'Shaughnessy failed to support his reputation. His next book was a collection of stories paraphrased from Marie de France, versified with great skill and ease, but lax and fluid to a fault. His third book, *Music and Moonlight*, in 1874, which was the last he lived to publish, was still more faulty, containing, indeed, several of the best songs of the decade and one or two very beautiful spiritual studies, such as “Outery” and “Song of Betrothal,” but otherwise almost unreadable. It is with a genuine sense of disappointment that we are obliged to confess that the process of degeneration has reached an even lower point in the posthumous volume before us. The songs are less delicate and melodious, the reverie more commonplace, the structure more lax than ever. In several of the pieces we recognize the old delicate manner, but the strain has become diluted, and to mix wine with water is to spoil the wine and spoil the water too. The longest poem, “Colibri,” contains about seven hundred lines, but seems to be unfinished. It describes, in verse which is distractingly inchoate and slipshod, the birth and training of a forest child, brought up in the gorgeous climate of Brazil. Tropical scenery was always attractive to Mr. O'Shaughnessy, and he frequently attempted to interpret the impression it leaves on a mind that has been saturated with it. In the *Epic of Women* the beautiful lyric called “Palm Flowers,” and in *Music and Moonlight* the much less successful piece called “Azure Islands,” are examples of this. But “Colibri” will never rank among his successes. The other poems in the volume are original and translated lyrics. The original poems are mostly of an exceedingly pathetic and mournful tone, the sorrow being occasionally redeemed by a flash of mystical and spiritual hope, in the manner which Mr. O'Shaughnessy had made his own. Here is a song which seems to us among the best in the book:—

Love, on your grave in the ground,
Sweet flowers I planted are growing;
Lilies and violets abound,
Pansies border it round,
And crowsips all of my sowing;
A creeper is trying to cover
Your name with a kiss like a lover.
Dear, on your grave, in my heart,
Grow flowers you planted when living,
Memories that cannot depart,
Faith in life's holier part,
Love, all of your giving;
And Hope, climbing higher, is surer
To reach you as life grows purer.

Something of the same tenderness and spiritual purity gives a kind of subdued charm to “Fallen Flowers,” “At Her Grave,” and “Eden.” The longer poem called “Lynmouth” is of a higher order of literary excellence, containing many admirable stanzas such as these:—

The green exuberant branches overhead
Sport with the golden magic of the sun,
Here quite shut out, here like rare jewels shed
To fright the glittering lizards as they run.
And there are perfect nooks that have been made
By the long-growing tree, through some chance turn
Its trunk took; since transformed with scent and shade,
And filled with all the glory of the fern.

The translations are particularly well done. They consist of copious examples from the lyrical work of the latest school of French poetry, with which Mr. O'Shaughnessy had only too dangerous a sympathy. He has selected, however, mainly such pieces as give the English reader a very favourable idea of these

* *Songs of a Worker*. By Arthur O'Shaughnessy. London: Chatto & Windus.

Poems. By May Probyn.

Three Women of the People; and other Poems. By Pakenham Beattie. London: Newman & Co.

Honey from the Weed. Verses. By Mary Cowden-Clarke. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

Songs of Study. By William Wilkins. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

Plaut. *Pers.*, v. 2, 53, and often in Plautus. Where, in the parallel passage of the *Menæchmi*, Plautus makes Menæchmus S. say "Jube te piam de mea pecunia," "get yourself expiated at my expense," he alludes, as Mr. Hildyard, *ad loc.*, remarks, to the "piatrix" whose services are referred to by Periplocomenus in his caution against matrimony in the famous passage in the third act. Other authorities read plicatricem, a "clothes folder," in that passage, which is very worthy of study as a Plautine *locus classicus*.

But we must turn to another meritorious edition of a classic—Mr. Postgate's masterly *Select Elegies of Propertius*, which, with its elaborate and exhaustive introduction, leaves little for any future editor to alter or emend. Based on the texts of Hertzberg and Böhrens, that of Mr. Postgate approaches the perfection of exactness, and if anywhere he disagrees with any editor—e.g. Mr. F. Paley—he meets the question boldly. In the introduction we find much curiously minute information, as, for example, when tracing the poet's birthplace—which, like that of so many other great poets, is in the North of Italy—he identifies that of Propertius with the fair and fertile valley between Perugia and the river Clitumnus, even that Asisium which also claims the honour of being the birthplace of St. Francis. On all the vexed questions of the long liaison with Cynthia, we read the carefully weighed reasonings of Mr. Postgate with a certain sympathy for the poet's advocate, and rejoice that the task of doing justice to a character which has been overmuch disparaged has fallen to one of the most acute of our younger scholars. The third chapter of his introduction gives us a high opinion of the author's insight into Propertius's syntax and vocabulary; while in the fifth chapter he deals judiciously with the poet's literary history and his relation to his predecessors. When we come to actual discussion of the poems, it is satisfactory to do so with one so well versed as Mr. Postgate in the turns of his author's manner. See his very first poem, 19-20:—

At vos deductæ quibus est fallacia lunæ
Et labor in magicis sacra piare focis,
En agendum domine mentem convertite nostram
Et facite illa meo pallete ore magis.

"Come ye, whose deceit would draw the moon from the sky, whose task it is to perfect solemn rites o'er magic fire, come and turn the heart of my lady, and make her paler than my face is pale." Mr. Postgate is disposed to see in "quibus est deductæ fallacia lunæ" those who practise the descent of the moon trick; the genitive being one of definition (see Roby, 1302) and a gerundive being more usual in the place of the participle. On one other noted passage in the second poem we must linger to note Mr. Postgate's nice handling (ii. 21):—

Sed facies aderat nullis obnoxia gemmis
Qualis Apelleis est color in tabulis.
Non illis studium vulgo conquirere amantes,
Illis ampla satis forma pudicitia.
Non ego nunc veror, ne sim tibi vilior istis:
Uni si qua placet culta puella sat est.

Hear the faithful translator. "No! their helper was beauty that owed no debt to jewels, like the hues on the paintings of Apelles. It was not their sole aim to hunt for lovers through the town. Chastity, a wealth of beauty, was theirs. I fear not that thou should'st hold me cheaper than those heroines of thine. Whosoever finds favour in one lover's eyes, that maiden is decked enough."

Mr. Arthur Sidgwick's *Agamemnon* deals with a play which will prove wholesome and fruitful study for a sound-headed, well-grounded sixth form boy. One admires the skill with which Mr. Sidgwick gets the well-arranged matter of his introduction (plot, early versions of the tale as found in the *Odyssey*, and moral and religious ideas of the drama) all into less than twenty pages. It has generally been the practice of critics to illustrate the *Agamemnon* mainly by the aid of its glorious succession of choral odes; yet it may be doubted if any of these are more telling than some of the level passages—e.g. where, in the third act, 810-944, Clytemnestra comes forth from the palace and answers Agamemnon's reserved address with a string of two-edged double meanings, which must have been pungent to an Attic audience. After the King's thanks for his return, his remarks to the Chorus about false friends, and his assurances that he will see all settled well for the State, Clytemnestra answers with her hollow ringing speech of mingled professions of honour to the victor, and covert irony from the false lips of an adulteress—a speech beginning with shameless assumption of a chaste matron's conjugal love before others, and the forlorn condition ironically affected in the word *ἔρημον*, 862. Mr. Sidgwick rightly adopts *τίτρηται*, with Ahrens, for *τέρεται* in 869, regarding the vulgate as flat after *τραυμάτων*, and cites in corroboration Morshead's version, "No network were as full of holes as he." Perhaps the climax of the passage is the fulsome language of Clytemnestra to her husband where she welcomes him as

τόνδε, τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα,
σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς στέγης
στύλον ποδῆρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρὶ,
καὶ γῆν φανεῖσαν ναυτίλοις παρ' ἐλπίδα,
κάλλιστον ἡμᾶρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χεῖματος,
δοιοπόρῳ διψῶντι πηγῶν ῥέος—

a high-flown string of encomiums which she puts together to preface the strewing of the victor's path with purple carpets, that so, in keeping with her covert phrase, "Justice may lead Aga-

memnon to a home unlooked for." In this passage, and in those with Cassandra that follow, Mr. Sidgwick has bestowed on the *Agamemnon* the services of an intelligent, shrewd, and ever vigilant commentator. As a taste of his criticism, we may refer to his estimate of what he terms Madvig's brilliant conjecture on v. 1228 of this play. The passage is in a speech of Cassandra, where for the text reading

οὐκ οἶδεν οἷα γλώσσα μισητῆς κυνὸς
λέξασα, κἀκρίνασα φαιδρόνους, δακὴν
ἀπὸς λαθραίων, τεύχεται κακῇ τύχῃ,

the speaker is generally interpreted to mean that Agamemnon "knows not what things a tongue of the vile she-hound, by long-drawn smiling welcome . . . shall accomplish by evil fate"; where *οἷα* is clumsy, *φαιδρόνους* a strange adjective, and the use of adjective for adverb harsh with *ἐκρίνασα*. In the difficulty Madvig, after Tyrwhitt, ventures a certainly ingenious alteration in *φαιδρὸν οὐς*, and in the next line reads *δῆξεται* for *τεύχεται*. The sense will then be, "knows not what a tongue of the vile she-hound has licked (his hand) and stretched out a joyful ear, and now, like a stealthy curse, shall bite him by evil chance." Mr. Sidgwick is evidently taken by the ingenuity of the reading *δῆξεται* for *τεύχεται*; but, on the whole, is deterred by the violent strain of language from admitting it into the text.

The last book on our list is hardly of the same calibre as the earlier three; but the examination we have bestowed upon it has served to show that it possesses such merits as a shrewd-witted private tutor would care most to ensure, and that these selections from the best Latin authors, both prose and verse, selected in co-operation by two experienced tutors, are excellently accredited, and backed by the judgment of practice and experience. The prose consists of selections from Eutropius, Cornelius Nepos, Livy, Cæsar, Pliny the Younger, and Tacitus; the poetry of well-chosen bits from Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius, to which are appended such "helps to construing" as, usually designated *notes*, would be gleaned from the pages of Moberley, Pritchard and Bernard, Conington and Bryce, Orelli, Maclean, and other careful annotators. Perhaps a desideratum still remaining is the constant reference to an acknowledged authority on matters of grammar. But we can speak confidently of the "Latin Selections," even at the point of usefulness to which they have already attained.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

DR. BERNHARD SCHWARZ'S visit to Algeria (1) was singularly well timed, and not less seasonable was his determination to collect all possible information respecting the political and administrative condition of the country, and the prospects of French colonization, instead of confining himself to the well-worn track of the ordinary traveller. His visit took place in 1879, two years before the events which have now fixed the attention of the civilized world upon Northern Africa. Without too many dry details, Dr. Schwarz contrives to give a vivid picture of the existing condition of French dominion in Algeria, which contributes to answer the important question how far France may expect to attain her object of converting the Mediterranean into a French lake by the permanent occupation of its northern shores. Any prospect of a real colonization would seem visionary in face of the fact that after fifty years' occupation the number of European inhabitants scarcely exceeded 400,000, and not half of these were French. Nor does there appear to be the slightest probability that the Arabs and Kabyles will ever be Gallicized, as the Gauls themselves were Latinized under the Roman sway. The brilliant side of French colonization is the material—splendid roads, railways, aqueducts, improved harbours, magnificent edifices, public and private, hotels in the Sahara, and post-offices in the gorges of the Atlas. The future of French rule in Africa is exceedingly difficult to forecast, for it is bound up not only with the fortunes of France herself, but with the fluctuations of French public opinion. It is extremely doubtful how far domestic circumstances and the strife of parties will allow the steady persistence in a policy of aggrandizement, regardless of blood or treasure, which would be requisite to subdue Africa from the frontiers of Egypt to the southern limits of Morocco, the acquisition of which latter State Dr. Schwarz fully believes to be contemplated. From this point of view he regards the appointment of a civilian governor as a mistake, and considers that it will be necessary to return to a purely military system. Dr. Schwarz was a witness of the splendid entry of the present Governor-General, M. Grévy, into Algiers, which he describes very graphically. His own visitation of Algeria was very systematic; beginning at Oran, he regularly surveyed the country as far as Constantine, the picturesqueness of which mountain city he describes in the most glowing terms. He further made an excursion into the Algerian Sahara, from Biskra to Sidi Okba, and his account of the natural characteristics of this region is very circumstantial. One of the most useful features of his book is the particular attention bestowed on the physical geography of Algeria, which contributes greatly to render the conditions and prospects of European occupation intelligible.

(1) *Algerien (Küste, Atlas und Wüste) nach 50 Jahren Französischer Herrschaft. Reiseschilderung, nebst einer systematischer Geographie des Landes.* Von Dr. Bernhard Schwarz. Leipzig: Froberg. London: Williams & Norgate.

Another work of travel of even greater interest, although the interest is much less topographical than biographical, is the publication of the private correspondence, chiefly addressed to members of his family, of the ill-fated Australian explorer, Dr. Leichhardt (2). They extend from 1834, when Leichhardt was a student at the University of Göttingen, to February 1848, when he was on the point of starting on the expedition from which he never returned, and the catastrophe of which is a mystery to this day. They give the most advantageous impression of the writer, who appears as the model of everything the youthful man of science should be—enthusiastic in his pursuits, simple in his tastes and habits, indifferent to material advantages, affectionate in his family relations, and admirably clear-headed and good-tempered. About half the volume consists of letters written chiefly from England, France, and Italy, before his departure for the Antipodes. He had, however, formed the project of Australian exploration at an early date, and it is frequently referred to. It is gratifying to observe how thoroughly such a man felt himself at home in England. France was less congenial to him. The Australian letters throw some light on the circumstances of New South Wales in those days; but, like the others, are chiefly interesting for their portraiture of the writer. The problem of the disappearance of Leichhardt and his party is fully investigated by Dr. Neumayer, whose long residence in Australia lends weight to his opinion. Leichhardt, who in his former expedition had traversed the northern portion of the Australian continent, from Moreton Bay to Port Essington, proposed in the second to cross it from north-east to south-west, from Moreton Bay to Swan River. Two points may be regarded as established—that the party was murdered by the natives, and that it did not reach the line now traversed by the overland telegraph, or some trace would have been discovered. Dr. Neumayer is inclined to repose a certain amount of confidence in some of the reports respecting it which have been received from native sources. One is curious; it refers to the existence of half-breeds in the bush, said to be the offspring of a member of the expedition who for a time escaped the fate of his companions. If this be really true, the fact must be positively ascertained some day.

Dr. Sophus Müller's (3) essay on the employment of animal patterns in early Scandinavian ornamentation seems worthy of the German rendering which it has received at the hands of Herr Mestorf. The study of archaeology contributes materially to the elucidation of the relations between the Northern peoples and the Roman Empire, and many of the facts already ascertained are very curious. Such are the abundance of productions of Irish art in Norway, contrasted with their rarity in Denmark and Sweden, and the indications of commercial intercourse between Scandinavia and the Caliphate of Bagdad.

The philological quarrel (*si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum*) between Dr. Zimmer (4) and Dr. Windisch is indeed animated, but the humour of it can only be enjoyed by persons skilled in ancient Irish. Dr. Zimmer accuses his antagonist of all manner of blunders, allowing, however, that his work may be useful to those who know nothing of the subject—an admission which it is impossible to reciprocate.

Dr. Julius Jung has found a very interesting subject in the provincial administration and organization of the Roman Empire (5). The materials for a complete picture of the social condition of the Roman provinces during the Imperial period are to be found not so much in the pages of classical authors as in inscriptions, laws, and public documents in general. Dr. Jung has diligently examined all these sources of information, and has condensed the results of his inquiry into an agreeable as well as a learned volume, replete, yet by no means overloaded, with erudition, and relieved, when the subject allows, with sketches of important historical passages affecting or elucidating the condition of the people, such as the rebellion of the Bagaude in Gaul and the Donatist troubles in Africa. Each province is the subject of a distinct chapter, and the entire book deserves to rank as a useful, though subordinate, companion to the great works of Friedländer and Marquardt.

Dr. Georg Schanz's treatise (6) on the commercial policy of England during the latter part of the mediæval period, more especially under the first two sovereigns of the House of Tudor, is a work of even greater research than Dr. Jung's, and is based upon a thorough study of the documents bearing upon the subject in the Record Office and the Venetian and Hanseatic archives, as well as Rymer's *Fœdera* and similar collections. The legislation of the country, especially with reference to domestic manufactures and the import and export of the precious metals, is also the subject of close investigation. Usury, trade-guilds, prices, wages, municipal regulations are all discussed in turn; and the diplomacy of the various European States in intimate commercial connexion with England is abundantly illustrated. Dr. Schanz's

work is by no means light reading, but is entitled to the character of a treasury of information laboriously collected by an amount of research of which subsequent inquirers will be only too thankful to find themselves relieved. The second volume contains a mass of charters, despatches, treaties, and other official documents, with tables of statistical returns.

Dr. Herbst's "Encyclopædia of Modern History" (7) is substantially a biographical dictionary of persons distinguished in history since the beginning of the fifteenth century, although countries also are included, and popular movements such as the Anti-Corn Law League. The execution seems very thorough and careful.

The years 1157–1159 are important in the history of the Church and the German Empire, being the first two years of Frederick Barbarossa, which determined the subsequent bent of his policy and laid the foundation of the great conflict between the Papacy and the House of Hohenstaufen. At this period Adrian IV., the solitary English Pope, sat on the Papal throne—a haughty and uncompromising asserter of the most extreme ecclesiastical pretensions, but inspired to a considerable degree by his Chancellor, Roland Bandinelli, whose disputed election as Pope and the consequent schism form the catastrophe of Herr Ribbeck's able and erudite monograph (8).

Herr Pischon (9) investigates the influence of Islam on domestic life, or social organization, and on the political constitution of Mohammedan States and their relations with unbelievers. In every point of view Islam is pronounced lacking, although Herr Pischon's admiration for the literary genius of Mohammed is almost excessive. It is, in fact, no easy matter to determine whether the inferiority of purely Roman Catholic and Mohammedan countries is to be attributed to their religion, or whether the religion and the inferiority are not both the product of a common cause. It can scarcely be believed that, if the Christian nations of the twelfth century had become Mohammedan, they would now be in as backward a condition as the Turks and Persians; and, if this is not so, it would seem to follow that the religion of the Orientals is rather a symptom than a cause of their general inferiority.

Herr Lippert (10), who has already applied the animistic theories of Mr. Tylor to explain some of the phenomena of Hebrew religion, now attempts a more general application to the religions of the Aryan peoples of Europe in general, especially the creeds of classical mythology and the primitive Germans. He finds everywhere a belief in the personal existence of the spirit after death the groundwork of religion, commencing with the veneration or propitiation of the individual soul, developing into the worship of ancestors, and then, through the deification of the latter, into the conception of gods. There is enough of indisputable truth in this theory to impart a plausible air to the whole; but Herr Lippert, like other framers of hypotheses, seems too much inclined to claim a monopoly of truth for his own.

The most important contribution to a generally agreeable number of the *Rundschau* (11) is Du Bois Reymond's discourse, delivered on the occasion of the Leibnitz anniversary, on "The Seven Enigmas of the Universe." They are, in fact, reducible to two—the difficulty of accounting for the beginnings of things, and of determining the relations of thought and matter, and these Professor Du Bois Reymond avowedly leaves much as he found them. A summary of Dr. Schliemann's life and work is well executed, but presents little novelty. There is an interesting paper on Colonel Huber-Saladin's privately printed biography of Count and Countess Circourt, the amiable and highly intellectual Orleanist couple known to English readers from Mr. Nassau Senior's reminiscences of their conversation and *salon*. Circourt appears to have been a man of extraordinary erudition, which he reserved for his intimates. A sketch of the love adventures of the author of *Siegwart*, Johann Martin Miller, affords an amusing picture of German sentimentality in its palmist days. Some letters written from Leipsic by a Saxon official, immediately before and after the overthrow of Napoleon at that city, indicate the hatred felt for the French even by their nominal allies. The October number is also above the average, beginning with a characteristic story by Paul Heyse, deftly constructed out of slight materials, and distinguished by delicate grace and finished elegance of style. There is also an extremely interesting paper, partly derived from the despatches of the Baron de Bourgoing, Charles X.'s and subsequently Louis Philippe's ambassador at the Court of the Czar Nicholas, on that potentate's attitude towards the Monarchy of July. Nicholas, warned by Pozzo di Borgo, appears to have foreseen the results of Charles's fatal policy, and to have energetically censured his violation of the Charter. He seems nevertheless to have been quite ready for a general coalition against France, and to have been mainly deterred by the absence of support from England and Prussia.

(2) *Dr. Ludwig Leichhardt's Briefe an seine Angehörigen*. Herausgegeben von Dr. Neumayer und Otto Leichhardt. Mit einem Anhang von Dr. G. Neumayer. Hamburg: Friederichsen. London: Nutt.

(3) *Die Thier-Ornamentik im Norden*. Archäologische Untersuchung von Sophus Müller. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt von J. Mestorf. Hamburg: Meissner. London: Nutt.

(4) *Keltische Studien*. Von Heinrich Zimmer. Hft. 1. Irische Texte mit Wörterbuch von C. Windisch. Berlin: Weidmann. London: Williams & Norgate.

(5) *Die Römischen Landchaften des Römischen Reiches*. Von Dr. Julius Jung. Innsbruck: Wagner. London: Williams & Norgate.

(6) *Englische Handelspolitik gegen Ende des Mittelalters*. Gekrönte Preisschrift von Dr. Georg Schanz. 2 Bde. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Williams & Norgate.

(7) *Encyclopædie der neuere Geschichte*. Herausgegeben von W. Herbst. Halbband 1. Gotha: Perthes. London: Williams & Norgate.

(8) *Friedrich I. und die Römische Curie in den Jahren 1157–1159*. Von Walter Ribbeck. Leipzig: Veit & Co. London: Williams & Norgate.

(9) *Der Einfluss der Islam auf das häusliche, sociale und politische Leben seiner Bekenner. Eine culturgeschichtliche Studie*. Von C. N. Pischon. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

(10) *Die Religionen der Europäischen Culturvölker, der Litaner, Slaven, Germanen, Griechen und Römer, in ihrem geschichtlichen Ursprung*. Von Julius Lippert. Berlin: Hofmann. London: Williams & Norgate.

(11) *Deutsche Rundschau*. Herausgegeben von Julius Rodenberg. Jahrg. VII. Hft. 12.—VIII. Hft. 1. Berlin: Paetel. London: Trübner & Co.

The idea that England, even under a Wellington Ministry, could have been induced to join in such a crusade, might, if it had been known, have prepared the world for the Czar's still more serious misapprehension of public feeling at the time of the Crimean war. M. Gambetta is the subject of a very lively article, mainly derived from the graphic reminiscences of M. Daudet, and couched in a much more eulogistic strain than could have been expected from a German writer. Ferdinand Hiller makes an agreeable addition to the literature of "Dialogues of the Dead" in a vision where he holds converse with the shades of departed poets and musicians.

"From Rock to Sea" (12) is a new miscellany, somewhat in the style of Westermann's *Monatshefte*. The literary matter is good, including contributions from Kinkel, Augengruber, the African traveller Nachtigal, Robert Byr, and other writers of repute; and, in particular, the commencement of a new novel by E. Werner, "The Egotist." The illustrations are copious and admirable.

(12) *Von Fels zum Meer*. Bd. I. No. 1. Stuttgart: Spemann. London: Williams & Norgate.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,355, OCTOBER 15, 1881:

Arrest of Mr. Parnell.
Mr. Gladstone on Ireland. Mr. Gladstone's Speeches.
English Policy in Egypt. The Conservative Leaders at Newcastle.
The Church Congress. Mr. Goldwin Smith at Dublin.
Rome and the Pope. The Great Go-between.
Brittany.
Ghosts in the *Daily Telegraph*. The Report on Legal Procedure.
The Author of Don Quixote. Voluntary and School Board Schools.
Angling Literature. Critics and Teachers of Music. The Modern Rough.
The Rise in the Bank Rate. The Cesarewitch.
The Imperial Gazetteer of India.
Galland's Journal at Constantinople. Art in Metal.
With the Kurram Field Force. Hours with the Players.
The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Missing Proofs. Recent Verse.
Some New Classical Editions. German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING THE PRETORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 32 by 22 feet, with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LIVERPOOL.
The Council of University College, Liverpool, are prepared to appoint a PROFESSOR to each of the following Chairs:

1. Modern Literature and History.
2. Natural History (including Zoology, Botany, and Geology).
3. Logic, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy.
The work of each Chair will commence in January 1882. The stipend of each Chair will be £350 per annum, together with two-thirds of the fees, the total stipend being guaranteed to be not less than £400 per annum.

Candidates are requested to send in their applications, and copies of their testimonials, to the Honorary Secretary, not later than November 1, 1881.

W. J. STEWART, Hon. Sec.
25 Lord Street, Liverpool.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LIVERPOOL.

LECTURERS IN FRENCH and GERMAN are REQUIRED, who will be expected to commence work not later than the middle of January next. The fixed salary will be small in amount, but the Lecturers will receive the whole of the fees paid by the Students attending their classes, and will be at liberty to undertake Private Tuition.

Applications, with testimonials, to be sent in by November 15, to the HON. SECRETARY of University College, 25 Lord Street, Liverpool.

PUBLIC READING and SPEAKING.—The Rev. ALEX.

J. D. DORSEY, B.D., late Lecturer at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Chancellor's English Medalist), Lecturer on Public Reading and Speaking in King's College, London, receives PUPILS at 13 Prince's Square, W.

THE Rev. J. H. CROSS, M.A., receives a small number of GENTLEMEN'S SONS to prepare for the Public Schools. High testimonials. Great advantages.—Address, 21 Sussex Square, Brighton.

MILITARY and CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.—There is a Department in connexion with BLAIR LODGE SCHOOL, POLMONT STATION, Edinburgh, for preparation for the above Examinations. Honours gained during the past year. Three Appointments to Woolwich Academy. Seventh Place for Indian Civil Service, &c. &c.—Full particulars on application to the HEAD-MASTER.

WOOLLEY GREEN, near HURSLEY, HANTS.—A. M. HEATHCOTE, B.A., Oriel Coll., Oxford, prepares YOUNG BOYS for Public Schools, &c. Number under Twenty. Two Resident Assistant-Masters. The house is quite in the country, and in a healthy position. Full particulars on application.—Address, Woolley Green, near Hursley.

INDIAN BOYS.—Rev. R. A. CAYLEY desires to make a HOME for Two or Three (brothers preferred), aged from Eleven to Sixteen, and to send to Public School with his own Sons.—For terms, &c., apply Scampton Rectory, Lincoln.

TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL, STRATFORD-ON-AVON.

The Warden, RICHARD CURRY, M.A., is assisted by Seven Resident Graduate Masters, two being specially for Modern Languages. Special preparation for the Universities, Army, and all competitive Examinations. Exhibition to the Universities of £50 per annum. Junior Department for Young Boys. Large Playing Fields, Gymnasium, &c. &c. Terms 5s and 6s Guineas.—Apply to the WARDEN.

SOUTH OF FRANCE.—An OXFORD M.A., and Barrister-at-Law (Married), an experienced and successful Tutor, residing in his own Villa, which is most beautifully and healthily situated one mile from the town of Hyères, receives SIX PUPILS in delicate health, who are prepared for the Universities, &c. Highest references.—Address, W. HENLEY CHATEL, Les Rosignols, Hyères (Var).

TUITION at ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA.—A Married CLERGYMAN (M.A. Oxon), without family, has vacancies for PUPILS to prepare for Public Schools or Universities. Former Pupils have passed successfully. Only Three received. Comfortable home a few minutes from the Sea. Highest references.—Address, Rev. R. HOWARD, 7 Church Road, St. Leonard-on-Sea.

PREPARATORY SCHOOL for SONS OF GENTLEMEN. ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA. Situation most healthy; sanitary arrangements perfect. Special care of delicate or very young Boys. References to Parents of Pupils.—For Prospectus address, Rev. W. HARRIS, Falkland House, St. Leonard-on-Sea.

THEOLOGICAL, UNIVERSITY, MILITARY, CIVIL SERVICE, and other EXAMINATIONS.—PUPILS rapidly and successfully prepared. Terms moderate. Highest references.—Address, Rev. W. H. ROWLANDSON, Great Braxted, Witham.

EDUCATIONAL HOME for the DAUGHTERS OF GENTLEMEN.—THE GRANGE, Edentich, BONN-ON-THE-RHINE, Germany. Number of Pupils limited to Twelve. Refined English home. Resident North German and Parisian Governesses. High-class Masters for accomplishments. Unexceptionable references.—Apply as above, to the Directress, Mrs. BREMSER.

LADY B. wishes to recommend very highly a SCHOOL on the South Coast, where her son has been educated for several years. The education given is thoroughly good, and the domestic arrangements are excellent. The Head Master is an Oxford M.A., and a Clergyman.—Address, LADY B., care of Mr. F. Golding, Bookseller, Minister Street, Reading.

SECRETARY, CASHIER, or CONFIDENTIAL CLERK.—An APPOINTMENT DESIRED by a GENTLEMAN, of considerable business experience, well accustomed to Book-keeping, Correspondence, and the Financial part of business. A moderate salary only required. The highest references can be given as to integrity and trustworthiness.—Address, H., 9 Villa Road, Brixton, S.W.

A RESPECTABLE COUPLE, giving up housekeeping, would be glad to meet with a SITUATION of TRUST in town or country. A gentleman or gentleman with fishing or shooting box would find them capable of doing all required; have been in good families.—Address, J. M., 7 Bayham Street, Camden Town.

HAMPSTEAD.—SOUTH HILL PARK GARDENS, within five minutes of Hampstead Heath Station, N. London.—TO BE LET or SOLD, a Freehold Double-fronted HOUSE, containing fourteen rooms, also bath-room, with a constant supply of hot and cold water. Reception and Bed Rooms most conveniently arranged. Domestic offices on ground floor; good garden at the rear. The house is in thorough repair, and most pleasantly situated.—For particulars apply to Mr. DOLMAN, House Agent, 62 Haverstock Hill, and 60 Queen Victoria Street, E.C.

TO BE LET, FURNISHED, for a long or short term, a Lady's HOUSE, in South Kensington, within ten minutes' walk of Earl's Court and West Brompton Stations. Contains Dining and Drawing Rooms, Library, and five Bedrooms, and good domestic offices. Rent moderate.—Address, A. B., 35 Cathcart Road, S.W.

HYÈRES.—TWO GOOD VILLAS (Eleven and Six Bedrooms) TO LET. Best sanitary arrangements.—Address, 8, English Bank, Hyères.

HOTELS.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel. BENJN. BULL, Manager.

ILFRACOMBE HOTEL.—On the verge of the Atlantic, in its own Grounds of Five Acres, with Tennis Lawn. Contains 250 Rooms, and is "a model of sanitary excellence." One of the largest Swimming Baths in England; also Private Sea-water Baths.—Every information of MANAGERS.

TOTLAND BAY, Isle of Wight, near Alum Bay.—TOTLAND BAY HOTEL. Magnificent sea views. Comfort, with moderate charges. Billiard-room and tennis lawn. Bracing air. Excellent sands and promenade pier. Good anchorage for yachts. Special train and boat service, Friday, 2.10 P.M., returning Monday, 7 A.M.—Apply to Miss FLEMING, Managers (late of the Langham Hotel).

BEDFORD HOTEL, BRIGHTON.—FAMILIES or GENTLEMEN intending to visit the Hotel are respectfully solicited to address their applications for rooms as early as possible, the Manager being very desirous of not disappointing his esteemed patrons.

"MACNIVEN & CAMERON'S PENS ARE A TREASURE."

THE "BIG J" PEN and THE "BIG WAVERLEY" PEN, 6d. and 1s. per box.

Sold by all Stationers throughout the World. 1,745 Newspapers recommend Macniven & Cameron's Pens. They come as a boon and a blessing to us all.

The Waverley, the Owl, and the Pickwick Pen. Specimen Box, all kinds, by post 1s. 1d. PATENTERS: MACNIVEN & CAMERON, 25 to 33 Blair Street, Edinburgh. Penknives to Her Majesty's Government Offices. (Estd. 1774).

Beware of the party offering imitations of these Pens.

SPECTACLES versus BLINDNESS.

ONE-FOURTH of those suffering from blindness can trace their calamity to the use of common spectacles or lenses imperfectly adapted to the sight. Mr. HENRY LAURANCE, F.R.S., Oculist Optician, PERSONALLY adapts his Improved Spectacles at his residence, 3 Endeavour Gardens, Euston Square, London, daily (Saturdays excepted) ten to four. SIR JULIUS BENEDICT writes: "I have tried the principal opticians in London without success, but your spectacles suit me admirably. The clearness of your glasses, as compared with others, is really surprising." DR. BIRD, Chelmsford, late Surgeon-Major, W.E.M., writes: "I could not have believed it possible that my night could have been so much improved and relieved at my age, 82. I can now read the smallest print, although suffering from cataract on the right eye." Similar testimonials from Dr. Radcliffe, Consulting Physician, Westminster Hospital; Ven. Archdeacon Palmer, Clifton; Major-General, C.P. Aldershot; the Rev. Mother Abbess, St. Mary's Abbey, Herndon, and hundreds of others. Mr. Laurance's Pamphlet, "Spectacles, their Use and Abuse," post free.

DECORATION.

MORANT & CO., having for many years carefully studied the best periods of Decorative Art, and having had great experience in carrying out important orders, will advise upon the DECORATION and FURNISHING of TOWN and COUNTRY HOUSES, prepare Designs, and execute the necessary works at moderate cost. MORANT & CO. personally superintend all work entrusted to them.

91 NEW BOND STREET, W.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices; no EXTRA Charge for time given. Large useful Stock to select from. Illustrated price Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—248, 249, and 250 Tottenham Court Road, and 16, 20, and 21 Mowbray Street, W.C. Established 1862.

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS.—Nothing is so highly appreciated as a case of GRANT'S MORELLA CHERRY BRANDY, which can be ordered of any Wine Merchant. Queen's quality, as supplied to Her Majesty, 42s. per dozen. Sportsman's special quality, 50s. per dozen.—Manufacturer, T. GRANT, Distillery, Maidstone.